

94 5-5-5-5-5
227 7.7.4

BAPTIST REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. I.

JULY, 1904.

No. 2.

IS THERE A TRUE, CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM?

BY PROFESSOR HENRY C. VEDDER, D.D.,
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

NOTHING could be more serviceable at the beginning of an inquiry like this than a definition. Indeed, if we are to avoid losing ourselves in a misty cloud of words, a definition is indispensable. And yet, a definition is practically impossible. There have been so many schools of mystics, there have been so many varieties of mystical teachings, some entirely incompatible with others, that to construct a definition satisfactory to all mystics is a task quite beyond the most acute and ingenious mind. Confronted by this dilemma, what shall we do? This seems to be at least a practical suggestion: let us seize, if possible, upon that which is common to all forms of mysticism, that fundamental doctrine on which all mystical systems have been built, and see if this is not capable of precise definition, of searching criticism, of exact appraisement.

This essential, fundamental doctrine of mysticism may be put into the form of a simple thesis: it is possible for man to have direct, immediate, intuitive knowledge of God. And, as this knowledge cannot be supposed to be barren, there follows the possibility that God can and does directly communicate to men an idea, an emotion or a power not otherwise attainable. To the saying of Ten-nyson,

Proposit
Corollary

We have but faith: we cannot know;
For knowledge is of things we see;

every mystic returns a denial, emphatic, unqualified. He pronounces this antithesis between faith and knowledge untrue to fact, and affirms that knowledge is not confined to what is received through the physical senses. All forms of mysticism are developments of this thesis. If this falls, mysticism has no longer any sure foundation; if this is valid, mysticism rests on solid rock, though some of its superstructure may require reconstruction.

Before we proceed further, let us take careful note of one important distinction. This fundamental thesis of mysticism is by no means the same as the contention of some that the existence of God is a first and necessary truth. This latter is the view set forth in the treatise on Systematic Theology by Pres. Augustus H. Strong, D.D., of Rochester. It does not at all concern us now to make examination of this theory, but it does concern us much to see clearly that the existence of God is an idea, a concept, while the thesis of the mystic is based upon a supposed fact of consciousness. Whether the idea of the existence of God belongs, as an idea, in the same category with the axioms of mathematics, is doubtless a very interesting question, but one not at all germane to our present inquiry. The mystic does not greatly concern himself with any of the arguments to prove the existence of God, or to explain the origin of any concept about him; his thesis goes back of all that; he professes to know God as existing, and if his claim can be substantiated, arguments to prove the existence of God are superfluous, or, at any rate, supplementary.

ex 2m
The first question that a Christian will naturally ask concerning this, or any like thesis, is, What have the Scriptures to say about it? Memory will instantly furnish forth a store of passages in which we are said to "know" God, or to have "knowledge" of God, and the concordance will supply a large additional number. But just here let us be cautious. It is safer to set aside at

once all these and like texts as inconclusive, and for this reason: the Bible is not a treatise on psychology and metaphysics. We are now using the words "know" and "knowledge" in their settled philosophical meaning, but we cannot be certain that the Scripture writers ever use them in that sense—or, rather, may we not be reasonably certain that they did not? All separate texts therefore, that seem to support the mystic's thesis we are safer to disregard, and come to a broader interrogation of Scripture. Doing this, we cannot proceed far without discovering that the Christian is necessarily a mystic to a certain extent, to a considerable extent. He cannot be other, without a denial of cardinal facts in his own experience, and a corresponding denial of three distinctive doctrines of the Christian faith: regeneration, union with Christ, sanctification. Each of these doctrines necessarily implies the direct action of God the Holy Spirit upon the human soul. Inexpugnable facts of consciousness confirm the doctrines; they are the deepest, the most sacred, the least questioned and least questionable of all our religious experiences. If these are real facts of consciousness and not mere subjective illusions or delusions—and no Christian has the least doubt or misgiving on this point—then mysticism in some form and to some extent must be true.

The phenomena of prophecy and inspiration necessitate a like conclusion, for they are conditioned upon the possibility of man's having a direct knowledge of God. If there could be a divine revelation to the prophets, not accomplished by a bodily appearance of God or the hearing of audible voices, then the possibility of immediate knowledge of God by all men follows of necessity. If this be not true, how could the prophet be assured that his supposed revelation was genuine? Or granting that in some way he obtained assurance for himself, how can he convey like assurance to us? For, if he had no imme-

mediate knowledge of God, if God did not speak directly and unmistakably to his soul, prophecy is reduced to nothing more than those solemn convictions of truth that all of us entertain, with more or less of frequency and certitude. If there was no immediate knowledge of God by the apostles, then the inspiration of the New Testament writers is no more than such religious exaltation as all of us know. That is to say, in the absence of immediate knowledge of God there is no rational proof that the content of prophecy or inspiration is more than this. No man can be certain there is more—the prophets and apostles themselves could not have been certain of possessing more.

One reply sometimes made is: “But it is conceded that prophecy and inspiration are special gifts.” The reply completely misses the point. Special gifts, like ordinary gifts, can be bestowed only upon those capable of receiving them. If there are no means of direct communication between God and man, if man is made in the image of God and yet God cannot speak to man so that man knows God as speaking, then the bestowal of special gifts of prophecy and inspiration was no more possible two thousand years ago than it is now. Or, if the bestowal was possible, it was still impossible that those who received the gifts should certainly know their source. Is not the poet nearer to the truth than many theologians, when he sings:

3. morning
Speak to him thou for he hears, and Spirit with spirit can meet—
Closer is he than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.

There is then a solid Scriptural basis for mysticism, a much stronger basis than could be furnished by any accumulation of mere proof-texts. Its basis is, in fact, the same as the basis of the Scriptures themselves, in so far as these are a revelation from God, unless we are to exhaust the word “revelation” of all real significance.

To deny the fundamental tenet or thesis of the mystic, is to take out of the Bible all that is distinctively Christian, and reduce the Christian religion to a purely naturalistic basis.

What says psychology to the thesis of the mystic? Before answering let us do away with possible misapprehension by noting that psychology returns an emphatic negative to some assumptions of some mystics. There is no separate organ or faculty for the apprehension of religious truth, as distinguished from other truth. "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned" does not imply the possession of such a faculty. Psychology and common sense alike cast suspicion on much vague rhapsody of mystical writers. Real facts of consciousness are capable of precise and definite statement. What is vague and shadowy is, so far, unreal. The ineffable knowledge and ineffable experience of which certain mystics have so much to say are simply ineffable bosh. Nevertheless, the fact that much fanaticism and folly have been mingled with mysticism should not prevent us from discovering whatever truth may be contained in it.

Psychology does recognize the validity of the facts of consciousness to which the mystic appeals. Many who will read these words are perfectly conscious of their experience of regeneration; they know the day and the hour when that great change occurred in themselves, as they know nothing else in all their lives. And what they were conscious of was this: that a mighty spiritual Power came into contact with their spirits and wrought this change. Consciousness testifies with equal clearness to the fact of the change, and to its being wrought by a Power not themselves. This analysis of consciousness is unimpeachable. Christians the world over, in countless multitudes, have testified to these facts. There is no such thing as a successful disputing of their validity,

and any psychology that does not take account of them is a narrow, mutilated, false psychology.

So as to union with Christ, or communion with God, as many mystics prefer to call it. The facts of consciousness are unquestionable also. A cloud of witnesses rises up to testify to the reality of such communion; and to one who has had such experiences there is no other reality of which he can be half so certain. The greatest of the apostles has left on record (2 Cor. 12:2-4) what is easily the most wonderful experience of the Christian ages, but there are modern instances that are sufficiently striking. Here is such an experience:

I stood alone with him who had made me . . . I did not seek him, but felt the perfect unison of my spirit with his. The ordinary sense of things about me faded . . . The perfect stillness of the night was thrilled by a more solemn silence. The darkness held a presence that was all the more felt because it was not seen. I could not any more have doubted that he was there than that I was. Indeed, I felt myself to be, if possible, the less real of the two. My highest faith in God and truest idea of him were then born in me . . . Having once felt the presence of God's spirit, I have never lost it again for long. My most assuring evidence of his existence is deeply rooted in that hour of vision.¹

Here is another, quite as typical:

I experienced a feeling of being raised above myself. I felt the presence of God . . . as if his goodness and his power were penetrating me altogether . . . I thanked God that in the course of my life he had taught me to know him . . . I begged him ardently that my life might be consecrated to the doing of his will . . . I felt his reply, which was that I should do his will from day to day, in humility and poverty, leaving him, the Almighty God, to be judge of whether I should some time be called to bear witness more conspicuously. Then slowly the ecstasy left my heart; that is, I felt that God had withdrawn the communion which he had granted. The impression had been so profound that in climbing slowly the slope I asked myself if it were possible that Moses on Sinai could have had a more intimate communication with God . . . God was present, though invisible; he fell under no one of my senses, yet my consciousness perceived him.²

Instances like these might be accumulated to any extent—a volume could easily be made up of testimonies of this sort. Psychology must recognize the existence in many individuals of these mystical states; the only

¹ Quoted by James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, pp. 66, 67.

² *Ibid*, p. 68.

possible question is as to the validity of these deliverances of consciousness. As to that, this fact must be taken into consideration: that to those who have had these experiences they are the most real things in their lives, more convincing than any facts witnessed by the senses, more certain than any conclusions that can be established by logic. Necessarily so, for to such these are facts certified by consciousness. To such, these are genuine perceptions of the truth, which no kind of adverse argument can disprove. When you have once known a thing, you can never not know it; what you have clearly seen you can never again not see. All the psychology and theology in the world can never deprive a man of what he has himself experienced and known, and so far as they try to do so they are false psychology and false theology.

Again, with regard to sanctification, there are equally well-attested facts of consciousness. Who has not heard, not once or twice merely, but a score of times, a testimony to this effect? "I was prone to the commission of a certain sin. Again and again I fought against it, and fell. I went to God on a certain day in an agony of soul, and prayed that he would give me the victory over sin, and he heard my prayer. I was distinctly conscious that the desire for that particular sin left me then and there, and I have never since had the slightest inclination towards it." Men have been permanently cured of the appetite for strong drink in this way; some have been completely delivered from a vicious habit of profanity, against which they had long struggled in vain—cured completely and at once, as their lives gave witness afterward. Many readers of these words, though their experiences may have been less marked, less dramatic than those just described, have not the less certainly known themselves progressing in sanctification through the power of God's Spirit. Psychology recognizes the validity of these facts;

it must recognize them, for they are capable of proof by unimpeachable human testimony, and they rest upon states of consciousness that cannot be rejected without invalidating all the deliverances of consciousness.

Then there is prayer. Nobody can pray without being in some sense a mystic. A man can "say prayers" without being anything or believing in anything, but genuine prayer is nothing else than communion with God. It is the most vital element of religion, the one act without which religion is either a mass of dead dogmas or a system of ethical precepts.

By prayer "the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

Religion, said Matthew Arnold, is morality touched by emotion. Mr. Arnold was on the right track, but he did not go far enough. Religion is doctrine and ethics vitalized; and the life essential to genuine religion, as it must be originated by divine power, so it can be sustained only by intercourse with the divine Life through prayer. Such intercourse must be real, not illusory, vital not formal; and that such intercourse can take place without any perception of it by the human consciousness is too absurd a proposition for refutation. Once more: if we are to obtain and maintain a divine life in the soul, we must obtain it from God, and it can be maintained only by conscious communion with God. Every Christian who has learned what prayer really is, whatever he may call himself, whatever theological or philosophical theory he may hold, is so far a mystic. He who has never felt the presence of God in his own soul as an unmistakable reality, has never prayed—he has only uttered words, at most he has only lifted up his soul in vain aspiration. He may have a philosophy, a theology, an ethics, but he has no religion.

You have doubtless noticed how hymnologists have solved many a problem over which theologians endless-

ly dispute, and in a way as efficient as simple have brought about a union of warring schools. So soon as the Arminian essays Christian song and takes as his theme man's salvation, he instinctively falls into the idiom of the Calvinist; while the Calvinist, so soon as he sings of the gospel and its invitations to sinners, as inevitably and naturally adopts the vocabulary of the Arminian. And so our Christian hymn-writers of all schools, though they may be railers at mysticism when they speak in the terms of theology or metaphysics, the moment they begin to sing of the soul's highest experiences, of the life that is hid with Christ in God, of human fellowship with the divine, of the soul drawing near to God in prayer, by their deeds they make unanimous confession that there is no adequate vehicle for their thoughts but the language of the mystic.

We have still to consider the philosophical objection to mysticism. There are those who admit substantially all that has been thus far said, namely, that these witnesses of mystics to their experiences are valid facts of consciousness, but nevertheless insist that the mystic misinterprets the testimony of consciousness. He knows a certain change in himself that we call regeneration, but he does not know God as causing that change. He has certain spiritual states that he perhaps rightly attributes to union with Christ as a cause, but he does not actually know himself as united to Christ. He can trace in himself a gradual increase in holiness of character, and he is doubtless right in ascribing this to the action of the Holy Spirit, but this is an inference, not a fact of consciousness—he does not actually know the Holy Spirit in the act of sanctifying him. If this objection is valid, the thesis of the mystic is refuted.

As to the validity of this objection, there is only this to be said: theology divides into two great schools over this problem, just as philosophy divides over the problem

of knowledge in general. As to the general theory of knowing, the idealist declares that what we know is nothing else than a series of sensations, purely subjective. Something is going on which we are compelled to refer to matter as a cause. The existence of an external universe is therefore purely a hypothesis, and all that we can really assert of matter is that it is a permanent possibility of sensation. The realist, on the contrary, insists that consciousness bears testimony to something more than sensation; we are conscious of contact with something not ourselves that is the source of the sensation. The Ego does not merely *think* the non-Ego, it *knows*. The external universe is not a mere hypothesis, it is an object of knowledge. Just so is it in theology, which has to solve a similar problem, the knowledge of God. The theological idealist says: You do not really know God, but certain religious emotions, states of consciousness, which you refer to God as a cause. This is inference, hypothesis, faith, call it what you will, only you must not call it knowledge. Not so, says the mystic, the theological realist; consciousness testifies not merely to religious emotions, but to the contact of the human spirit with a Spirit, not ourselves, who is the cause of those emotions. It is a question as to the true interpretation of the religious consciousness, and to the end of time men will differ regarding the problem of religious knowledge, precisely as they differ in the theory of knowing in general. Christian thinkers will continue to range themselves on the one side or the other of this question, less because of the logical force of the arguments advanced pro and con, than in accordance with their temperamental susceptibility or insusceptibility to spiritual realism. One man is born an aristocrat and another a democrat; one has a natural bias towards radicalism, another towards conservatism. Reason, argument has less to do than is commonly supposed with determining these fundamental re-

lationships of any of us. So one man is born a mystic and another a rationalist.

But, it may be further objected, is it not true that mystics have often been misled by their supposed knowledge? Have they not been betrayed into all manner of vagaries, into enthusiasm, into fanaticism? And does not this show that mysticism involves dangerous error? The objection does indeed point out a serious danger. Every truth is dangerous, in the sense that it may be, has been, misunderstood, misinterpreted, misapplied. Most mystics have not been trained psychologists and metaphysicians, and because they did not know how to analyze their own spiritual states and evaluate them correctly, they may have made grave errors in the practical use of their great truth. Not all our states of consciousness having to do with religion are the result of God's contact with the soul. Some of these states have a perfectly naturalistic explanation, some may be inexplicable, most of them are curiously complex. Too many Christians, who would not be classed as mystics, at once ascribe to the agency of the Holy Spirit every religious sensation, thought, impulse; but experience (to say nothing of Scripture) teaches the folly of this. Men say, "The Spirit prompts me to say this," "The Spirit led me to do that." But in many cases this is demonstrably untrue. There are well authenticated instances such as the following: A minister was powerfully impressed as he passed a house, that it was his duty to speak to the inmates about the welfare of their souls. He passed on, but became uncomfortable because of refusing to hearken to what he took for the voice of the Holy Spirit that he turned back, rang the bell and—found the house empty. A Christian worker was greatly impressed with his duty to speak to a man on a ferry-boat, and, believing this to be the voice of the Spirit, he obeyed, and after talking to the man earnestly several minutes was in-

formed that his labors were useless, for the man was stone deaf. These interpretations of consciousness were ludicrously incorrect.

The analysis of our spiritual processes proves that in relatively few cases are we actually conscious of contact with the divine. What is often mistaken for such contact is really a very complex state, made up in part of memory of previous genuine experiences, partly of association of general religious ideas, of inferences from the supposed meaning of texts of Scripture, and the like. You are incredulous, perhaps. The analogy of sense perception again offers an illustration. When a psychologist says that in looking about a room the sense of sight tells one nothing of the relative distances of objects, that they are all seen in a flat plane, and that recognition of distance is not a visual percept but a complex mental process, so habitual that we are not conscious of it, the result of innumerable former perceptions through the sense of touch—hearing this for the first time one would possibly laugh him to scorn. But if one knows anything of psychology, he knows this to be an elementary truth. Our perceptions of the external world through the senses are as few and simple as the bits of glass and buttons that we put into a kaleidoscope, and the ideas that we combine from them are as marvellous in their complexity as the images that once delighted us in that toy. Our spiritual processes are of like character, so like that one is tempted to say identical. In the few great crises of life, in the rare golden moments, we come face-to-face with God and see the King in his beauty. And afterward, remembering these experiences, and mingling with them a thousand other memories, emotions and inferences, we too often mistakenly refer these complex states to a single cause, the direct agency of God.

The truth is, there is a great difference among Christians in the depth of their spiritual insight and the vivid-

ness of their emotional experiences, as in the clearness of their intellectual perceptions of the truth. This is to be expected, and should be allowed for, but such is seldom the case. The pity is that members of either class have so little tolerance for the deficiency of the others. The spiritually minded are very prone to suspect lack of true knowledge of Christ in those whose intellectual power overshadows and keeps more or less dormant their emotional nature; while the keenly intellectual are liable to look with something very like scorn or contempt upon those to whom religion is chiefly an affair of the heart, and scarcely at all a subject for thought. But somehow a *modus vivendi* must be found for these two types of Christian character, for both are legitimate and both are needed.

What are the criteria then by which we shall distinguish the true mysticism from the false? There are at least two, one human, the other divine. The human test is experience. There are illusions of the senses that must be corrected by experience; that is to say, carefully repeated and carefully observed perceptions of things must be compared until error is eliminated and the facts of consciousness are accurately apprehended and interpreted. All this is familiar. What is not so familiar, but quite as necessary, is the careful observation and comparison of religious states of consciousness, in which interpretation is ordinarily synchronous with sensation, until error has been eliminated. When we wrongly interpret perceptions of sight, we can correct the error by the sense of touch or of hearing, and *vice versa*. So one set of spiritual perceptions may be corrected by another, or by comparison with fact. If in the experience of any it should be found that a strong impression of duty corresponds to objective fact, and if an inward impulse to do a certain thing were invariably accompanied by some peculiar fitness of external conditions for the doing of that

precise thing, it would be a rational conclusion that the Holy Spirit originated the impulse and divine Providence prepared the conditions. If there were no such correspondence between inward impulse and outward conditions, some other hypothesis would be necessitated.

Take, for example, what is known as a call to the ministry. A young man is conscious of a strong inward impulse to preach the gospel. As the months go by, this impulse, possibly faint in the beginning, is strengthened and deepened until it becomes a moral conviction—he knows something of the intensity of feeling that drew from the Apostle the words, “Woe is me if I preach not the gospel.” Some of the best ministers living never had so overmastering a conviction as this; the experience is purposely described in its most vivid and striking form. And in this form, are we all bound to accept such a call as unmistakably genuine? By no means, for there have been cases where even such a “call” turned out to be not from God. We recognize that no young man’s conviction of his duty to preach the gospel is enough, in itself, to qualify him for that office. Such a conviction must be submitted to rational tests, such as, Has the young man any such gifts, physical, mental, moral, as give reasonable assurance that he would be a useful minister? This question satisfactorily answered, another follows, Has he such training, or can he secure such training, as will fit him for the work to which he feels himself called? Favorable reply being made to this question, it is next asked, Do others, judicious men and women, recognize in him abilities and qualities suitable to the ministry—are his brethren as surely called to hear as he deems himself called to preach? When this question also has received an affirmative answer, there is good ground to believe that the Holy Spirit has called the young man to preach—and not till then.

This fairly illustrates the method of testing the valid-

ity of our religious impulses and emotions. They are not to be credulously received as certainly of divine origin, nor unceremoniously dismissed as mere illusions, but are to be rationally and rigorously tested by such means as individual and combined Christian experience suggests. It is only when, as has too often happened, the mystic refuses to test his states of consciousness by fact and reason, but accepts all of them as of unquestionable validity, and interprets these facts in one invariable way, that he becomes an enthusiast and fanatic.

And one of the prime teachings of experience is that direct communication by God to man of religious ideas, emotions, powers, while always possible, is not the usual divine method. The notion that because this is peculiarly the dispensation of the Spirit, therefore the Holy Spirit is continually communicating to men spiritual power not otherwise attainable, is one of the mischievous distortions of truth for which the Keswick movement is mainly responsible. Experience directly contradicts this idea. Experience confirms the Scripture teaching that the Spirit usually operates upon our spirits through the truth. It does not follow that because we can speak directly to God, God will always speak directly to us. He can, he may—no bounds can be set to his grace—but he probably always has spoken and he probably always will speak to us through the truth. The Spirit, in response to our prayers, can, may and doubtless will (if those prayers are genuine) endue us with new power; but probably he will do so by illumination of our spirits to receive and appropriate truth already revealed, not by any direct communication of spiritual energy. He will rather teach us to make the most of endowments and opportunities already ours, but not fully possessed, not fully utilized, than impart any new and wonderful abilities. The experiences related by such men as Campbell Morgan and F. B. Meyer have misled not a few into

supposing that there is some way by which a special endowment of the Spirit can be obtained that will make of any man such preachers as they. But this is altogether a delusion, likely to do much harm if it gains acceptance among ministers and ministerial students. Submit this notion to rational tests, suggested by experience, and what is the result? These were men of peculiar and remarkable gifts, native and acquired, whom the Spirit has indeed made wonderfully successful, precisely because they were extraordinary men. All their successes have been along the direct line of their individual capacities. The Spirit has simply taken what they were and raised it to the *nth* power. That Spirit, it may be presumed, will do a like work for any who will permit; that is to say, he will take men with their several individualities, powers and acquirements, and make each the best preacher of the gospel he is capable of becoming. But if men delude themselves, or suffer themselves to be deluded, into the belief that the Spirit will make of them a Morgan, a Spurgeon, a Brooks, purely by divine power, without reference to what a man is by nature and what he may become by training, there is a painful disillusionment to come.

And what has just been said furnishes the only satisfactory explanation of another observed fact, namely, that some of the most devout and saintly souls have had none of the special experiences described in the earlier part of this paper. Many of the choicest Christians have not only not known God in regeneration, but have no remembrance whatever of their conversion. The testimony of their consciousness no more tells them when they were born again than when they were first born. That they were once born they know, for they know themselves as living men and women; that they were born again they know, for they know themselves to be Christ's; but of the when and how and where they know no more in the one

case than in the other. And there are others who have never been conscious of any hour of exalted communion with God, some who have never enjoyed any special vision of God, some who have never had any exceptionally strong conviction or impulse that they thought came from God. And the more genuinely Christian such people are, the more prone are they to torment themselves with such questions as: Since I do not have these experiences of which others speak, is there not something wrong in me? Why does not the Spirit speak to me as he does to others? Why does not God reveal himself to me as to others? Can I be right with God and lack these experiences?

To the last question, Yes, most emphatically, Yes. And on this ground: these are not the normal and usual methods by which God communicates with men, but the wholly unusual and exceptional. If all enjoyed them they would cease to be exceptional and become normal. If a Christian finds himself deficient in some normal experience, he may perhaps have good reason to ask himself if he is right with God. But rightness with God has nothing to do with experiences that are exceptional; these are within the sphere of God's special grace, which he bestows upon whom he will—gifts to be gratefully received if he bestows them, but not an occasion for unhappiness or distrust when they are withheld. It is no part of God's plan that we should all be cast in one spiritual mould, or that a single type of experience should be universal.

The other test is recognition of the fact that the Holy Spirit has spoken to others also; and since God is the author of truth and of order, not of confusion and falsehood, it follows that no genuine utterance of the Spirit can contradict any other. But the Spirit has spoken in an especial manner to and through the prophets and apostles, so that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments have been rightly accepted by Christians of all ages as the supreme and authoritative voice of the Spirit.

Therefore, whatever spiritual states, emotions, experiences, are not in accordance with Scripture are *ipso facto* invalid and untrustworthy. But, as we have seen, it is not really the deliverances of consciousness that contradict or outrun Scripture, but the erroneous interpretations of these facts that we unconsciously make. Our interpretations are therefore to be continually challenged and compared with the Scriptures. On the one hand, these personal experiences will help us to a better exegesis of Scripture; on the other hand Scripture, correctly interpreted, will keep us from misunderstanding the testimony of consciousness, and when at length the voice of the Spirit, speaking through the Scriptures, witnesses with the Spirit in our hearts, we may be certain that we have the truth.

If these criteria are fully recognized and faithfully applied, there is no danger in mysticism, but great gain. It founds the Christian life on the solid rock of personal knowledge, while efficient safeguards are provided against fanaticism. Such a mysticism is true, because its ultimate principle is that which validates all truth, namely, trust in the testimony of consciousness. It is Christian, because it subordinates the experience of the individual to the Scriptures and the Christian consciousness of the ages.

Read Aug. 25, 04. Most helpful
to me in some problems long
pondered.

ALVAH HOVEY AS THEOLOGIAN AND TEACHER.

By REV. HENRY M. KING, D.D.,
Providence, R. I.

IT is difficult to estimate personal influence, to measure the results of a single life, to determine the value, absolute or relative, of service rendered to the cause of Truth, and to the progress of the kingdom of God among men. But it is safe to say that the influence of no man in the Baptist denomination in this country during the last half-century has been more beneficent and far-reaching than his, who for fifty-four years was officially connected, as Professor and President, with the Newton Theological Institution; that no man's labors have been more abundant or more abundantly blessed than his, and that no man's service has surpassed his in its ministry to the intelligent piety, the growth and the commanding position of the Christian body with which he was connected. As the respected and beloved teacher in Theology of nearly two generations of students who have gone forth from his class-room to be the teachers and leaders of a great and growing denomination of Christians, he sat at the fountain head of human influence, the streams of which have blessed not only every section of our own land, but well nigh all lands.

Alvah Hovey, D.D., LL.D., was born in Greene, N.Y., March 5, 1820. He graduated at Dartmouth College, in 1844, and at the Newton Theological Institution in 1848. He was Assistant Instructor in Hebrew in his theological Alma Mater from 1849 to 1854, Professor of Church History from 1853 to 1854, Professor of Christian Theology from 1854 to 1870, Professor of Theology and Christian Ethics from 1870 to 1900 and Professor of In-

troductio and Apologetics from 1900 to September 6, 1903, the date of his death. He was acting Professor of New Testament Interpretation from 1892 to 1894, and President of the Institution from 1868 to 1899. His public service was all rendered in connection with this Institution, except that he was pastor for a single year (1848-1849) of the church in New Gloucester, Me.

It will be seen that for forty-six years he occupied the chair of Christian Theology, during which his labors were devoted almost exclusively to that department. For five years he gave instruction in the Hebrew Scriptures, and for two years, by reason of some exigency in the Institution, he gave instruction in the Greek Scriptures. But during all the years of his life, spent in ministerial education, he was a most diligent student and careful interpreter of the Word of God, and could pass from one chair to another in the Seminary with the utmost ease and success. His extensive work as editor and author of commentaries was most congenial to him, and revealed the ability and the habit of a skilled interpreter. His Commentary on the Gospel of John, for whose spiritual understanding and unfolding few men have had such eminent qualifications of insight, sympathy and personal likeness to the author as Dr. Hovey possessed, will always remain a monument to his wide and thorough scholarship and his rare ability as an exegete.

It is, however, as a student and teacher of theology that Dr. Hovey is best known and will be longest remembered. It was in this department that he especially served and honored the Institution, and achieved the success of his life. He cannot be said to have bowed to the authority, and accepted the theological system of any human master. He was familiar with all phases of theological thought, ancient and modern, Athanasian and Arian, Calvinistic and Arminian, Evangelical and Rationalistic, and reached his own conclusions, and formulated his own doctrinal

views independently of all. Perhaps he may be most accurately described as moderately Calvinistic and thoroughly evangelical. He had no such peculiarities of doctrine as made him the creator or founder of a special school of thought, which should bear his name. He discovered no new truth, and originated no formula of truth, which distinguished him from other theological teachers. He placed no such emphasis upon any one truth as to exaggerate its importance, and make it the center of a system, around which all other truths must revolve, or in relation to which all other truths must be interpreted. Some teachers, who have secured wide reputation, would have lived and died unknown, had it not been for their advocacy of some peculiar view or for some theological aberration, which attracted attention for a time, and then was quietly laid away in the cabinet of abandoned beliefs. Schools of theology, of respectable size and considerable influence, are sometimes founded upon half-truths, or the over-emphasis of one truth to the neglect of other truths clearly revealed and equally important. The fame and the great influence of Dr. Hovey were achieved by other methods. He had no theological fad or hobby. To him all revealed truths were sacred, to be rightly apprehended, to be implicitly accepted, to be held in right relations, and to be lovingly and fearlessly taught, for the enlightenment, the conversion, and the sanctification of men.

The language which he employed as descriptive of the theological teaching of his intimate friend, Prof. Edwards A. Park, at a Memorial Service held in Boston, January 6, 1901, is no less applicable to himself. "The substance of his theological teaching was not a system of philosophy, though it was closely reasoned and profoundly philosophical; nor was it a system of ethics, though it was closely united with moral law and profoundly ethical in spirit; but it was the Gospel of Jesus Christ, lustrous and vital throughout with the living and loving personality of God,

and appealing to reason, to feeling, to imagination, and to will,—that is, to the whole spiritual nature of man,—thus proving itself to be in our day, as in Paul's, the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

Dr. Hovey's theology was pre-eminently Biblical, though the chair which he occupied did not bear that distinctive title. It had been dropped at the coming to Newton of Dr. Barnas Sears in 1835, Dr. Hovey's predecessor both as Professor and President. In Dr. Hovey's admirable *Life of Dr. Sears*, he says: "The title, 'Christian Theology,' was now given for the first time to a chair of instruction in this seminary. It took the place of the chair of 'Biblical Theology,' probably because the latter designation had begun to be used in a more restricted sense, to signify historical theology as taught in different books of Holy Scripture, rather than theology derived by synthesis from the teaching of the whole Bible. Christian theology, as understood by Professor Sears, was to be drawn primarily from the Scriptures, yet their doctrines were to be logically arranged, and, as far as possible, rationally supported."

In his Introduction to "Outlines of Christian Theology," Dr. Hovey defines his purpose in the following succinct statement: "Theology has been denominated Biblical, Dogmatic, Historical, Polemical, etc., according to the aim and method of its treatment by different writers. It will be our aim to make the following course *chiefly Biblical*. For only by so doing can we pay suitable respect to the Word of God, guard ourselves from the danger of interpreting that Word into harmony with our independent speculations, habituate our minds to a method of discussing Christian doctrines safe in itself and adapted to the pulpit, obtain the clearest and deepest view of religious truth, and derive the greatest spiritual benefit from our studies." The aim, as here deliberately expressed, was sixfold, viz., to pay proper respect to the

Word of God as an authoritative revelation of truth, to be saved from the too common peril of seeking to harmonize revealed truth with fanciful and foolish speculation, to learn to think of truth and discuss truth in a way to preserve its integrity, and also with a view to its most effective proclamation from the pulpit, which is to adhere to the truth as its supreme message, to allow the truth to shine in its own resplendent light with undimmed outline and unclouded fulness, and to secure for the spiritual life the richest results from its contemplation and study. No higher aim can be conceived in the study of theology in a Christian seminary. No other aim is justifiable or allowable in a teacher who is called to assist men in their preparation for the Christian ministry. No teacher ever adhered to that aim more firmly, or carried it out more successfully, than Dr. Hovey, from the beginning to the end of his long service.

His theology was drawn directly from the Holy Scriptures, and was determined by their careful and conscientious interpretation. However much he may have allowed his mind, in the quiet of his study, to soar in wild flights of speculation, or to philosophize beyond what is revealed, he never allowed the unsubstantial and unverifiable results of such explorations to take the place of the obvious teachings of the Word of God or to partake of their authority. It was this that made him always a close student of the Bible, that kept him familiar with every phase of modern Biblical criticism and its bearing upon the trustworthiness of the Scriptures (a familiarity that often surprised those who knew his busy life), and that caused him to place at the very beginning of his course in Theology, as absolutely fundamental, a carefully prepared chapter on Bibliology, treating the historicity of the New Testament, the infallibility of Christ as a Teacher sent from God and the impersonation of truth, the promise of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of truth, and its ful-

filment, the endorsement of the Old Testament records as given by inspiration of God and worthy to be called the Word of God, and indeed the whole question of the nature and extent of inspiration.

Having thus laid broad and deep the foundation, he proceeded to build upon it his theological structure, or rather having established the credibility of the Scriptures as the source of Christian knowledge, he was prepared to draw from them the true doctrines of God and man, of salvation and destiny. He welcomed light from all quarters, from nature, reason, conscience and human history, so far as it shone upon the problems of God and religion. But the Bible he accepted as "the principal source of Christian knowledge, because the peculiar doctrines of Christianity are drawn from this Book, and stand or fall with its divine character." To undermine the foundation was to destroy the whole structure. To shake confidence in the authoritativeness of the source was to impair the validity of the doctrinal teachings drawn from it. Without the Scriptures there may be natural theology, but the vital element of Christian theology is gone. Christian theology is natural theology plus the divine Christ and his atoning work, miracle, inspiration and eternal redemption.

The theology of Dr. Hovey may be said to have been systematic as well as Biblical, though not in an objectionable sense. He declared "the Scriptures do not attempt to exhibit the truths of religion in a scientific form. They present these truths, as the works of God are presented in nature, to be examined and classified by us." Yet they are closely related to each other, suggestive of each other, and in some sense dependent upon each other. They are taught disconnectedly in the Bible; they may be arranged logically by the devout mind. The doctrines are divine; the arrangement is human, but that does not make the doctrines any less divine or less worthy of ac-

ceptance. Natural science is the human classification of the ascertained facts of nature. Theological science is the orderly arrangement of the truths of God and religion. Such an arrangement is possible, because truth is always self-consistent and harmonious, and kindred truths, that is, truths which lie within the same realm of knowledge, must ever bear some relation and proportion to each other. To seek to ascertain that relation and proportion, to discover the harmony of the truths of religion, is to study the science of theology, a science which has been denominated rightly "the Queen of all the sciences," for it furnishes the sublimest themes possible for human study and investigation.

Dr. Hovey believed that there is a system of Christian truth, correlated and discoverable, in which God makes himself known, as truly as there is an animal system with parts mutually related in which the animal spirit lives and manifests itself. He did not hesitate to employ the familiar illustration of the distinguished scientist to set forth his belief—"From the peculiarities of a single bone Cuvier was able to conjecture all the other parts of an extinct species of animal." But Dr. Hovey did not lay as much stress upon the formulated system as he did upon the verity of the individual truths which in his judgment compose the system. He could see "a definite connection between righteousness, atonement and pardon; Christ's theanthropic nature, his vicarious suffering and his kingship; depravity, regeneration, faith, pardon and sanctification," and he believed that in due time every man accepting these great doctrines of grace would find himself holding them in one harmonious system of divine truth, each confirming and corroborating the other. To hold one truth in its integrity would be to find it easy to accept any and all truths of Christian theology. To be in error at one point is to be in danger of missing the truth at many points. To belittle human sin is to belittle

the divine Christ, his person and his atoning work, to belittle the Holy Spirit and his office in regeneration and sanctification, and to depreciate the whole character of divine forgiveness and human redemption. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."

Moreover, Dr. Hovey's theology was not dogmatic, assertive without argument or evidence. It recognized the function of the human mind and its normal action in the consideration and acceptance of religious truth as of all truth. It made its first appeal to reason in establishing the claims of the Bible to be the Word of God, and sought ever to commend its doctrines to the intelligent acceptance of men.

Dr. Hovey never intimated that his *ipse dixit* was to be accepted as an authoritative statement of truth, or even that the teaching of the Bible was to be received without careful thought, and examination and the ordinary processes of acquiring knowledge. He had only contempt for the irrational confession *credo quia impossibile est*.

Making necessary allowance for human limitations, and the inability of the finite to comprehend fully the Infinite, e. g., the being of God, the modes of his existence, the method of his gracious activity and the mystery of his providence, Dr. Hovey held firmly to the conviction that the Christian system is a reasonable system of truth, that it commends itself to every man's enlightened conscience. Dr. Hovey believed no less strongly than Martineau that "second-hand belief asserted at the dictation of an initiated expert, without personal response of thought or reverence, has no more tincture of religion in it than any other lesson learned by rote." To him faith in the truths of Christian theology never demands intellectual inactivity, or the disuse, much less the overriding, of the faculties with which God has endowed man. It rather carries with it the consent of the whole mind in normal ac-

tion. As a man is to love God with all his heart, soul, mind and strength, so a man is to believe in Christ and in the truths of the Christian religion with all his heart, soul, mind and strength.

Dr. Hovey saw no reason to question the harmony of Christian truth, when rightly understood, with the impartial reason and the enlightened conscience. They can never originate it or discover it; but they invariably confirm it. Amid the heated discussions that have been going on during the last half century as to the seat of authority in religion, and the frequent assertions that "As a religion of authority Christianity has finished its course," Dr. Hovey calmly maintained his unshaken belief in the infallibility of Christ, as claimed by himself and evidenced by his moral excellence, by the character of his doctrines, by his superhuman wisdom and power, and by his miraculous birth and resurrection, and so, accepting the fulfillment of Christ's promise of the Spirit of Truth to his disciples in the preparation of the New Testament, and his undoubted recognition of the Old Testament Scriptures as the veritable Word of God, he held fast to that system of truth of which Christ himself may be said to be both the center and the circumference, —and all this, in the full exercise of his highest reasoning powers. The seat of authority was outside of himself indeed, but voluntarily accepted and affirmed by his whole moral and rational being.

It may be asked, was Dr. Hovey's theology progressive? It may be answered, understanding the word in a true and proper sense, as indicating a deeper and fuller apprehension of the great doctrines of revealed religion and a clearer perception of their relation to each other, that it was. But understanding the word, as it is frequently used, to denote a departure from the fundamental and essential truths of Christianity, it can be said that Dr. Hovey's theology was not progressive. He is

known to have said at the age of eighty years, after a long life of unwearied and delightful study of Christian truth, that he knew a great deal more about the Word of God then than he knew at thirty years of age. It could not be otherwise than that he had "grown in grace and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ." A ripening character and a progressive life are dependent upon a progressive knowledge. Not in this life, however prolonged, will the soul be able to fathom "the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God." But Dr. Hovey never found reason to abandon the evangelical truths which he incorporated into his formulated system of theology. So far as known, not one of them did he repudiate in his later years, or modify beyond identification.

He saw the drifting away from old landmarks even by some honored brethren, he watched closely the tendency of rash, destructive criticism, of which he kept himself fully informed, he listened attentively to every argument advanced in favor of a new and modified theology, he weighed carefully the claims of philosophy and rationalism as interpreters of religious truth, he accepted all well established truth of science or religion, but he remained steadfast in his adherence to the results of a sound exegesis of the Word of God, and loyal to the faith which he believed was "once delivered to the saints," and intended for the saints of all time, by which men were to be brought to a true knowledge of God, and sanctified and transformed into the likeness of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. He undoubtedly had new and clearer visions of old truth, and the clearer apprehension of an old truth is as valuable as the discovery of a new truth, especially if its truthfulness is doubtful. He saw the necessity of presenting truth in such a way as to meet the exigencies of modern thinking. He was alive to the conditions in which he lived, and ever open minded to the

light. He said, "It is not wise to leave out of sight the age in which we live, and the specialities of our own labor." He felt that special truths need to be emphasized at special times. He changed his forms of expressing truth and his theological definitions, as his own larger apprehension of truth and its clearer elucidation to others demanded. But his theology remained substantially the same year in and year out.

His theology was thus saved from being the uncertain, fickle, kaleidoscopic, ever changing thing which theology is sometimes represented to be, and even expected to be. We are told that "theology is human and variable, and religion is divine and permanent." That may be true or false according to the meaning of the words. If by theology is meant the systematizing of theological truths, the statement needs no contradiction. If by it is meant the whole content of theology, as sometimes seems to be intended, to the disparagement of theology, it is not true. Theology has its permanent, its unchangeable elements, otherwise it is all speculation, and unworthy to be called a science, or to be an object of human study. On the other hand religion, unless by it is meant the indestructible religious nature of man, which would be putting the faculty for its exercise, has its variable elements and is intensely human as well as changeable. "Religion, to be genuine, must be founded upon objective truth." It is born of theology, and receives its character and value from the theological conceptions that lie back of it. "As a man thinketh, so is he." The worst kind of confusion results from a lack of clear definition.

Again we are told that "the Bible is not a book of theology, but a book of life. Again it may be replied—True or false. True, if by theology is meant a formulated system, but false, utterly false, if it is meant that the aim and purpose of revelation is not to give to mankind a true knowledge of the being and character of God,

without which knowledge the world was in darkness and the shadow of death. "This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." The Bible is a book of life, because, and only because, it is a book of theology. Paul had a theology, John had a theology, and Christ had a theology, not discordant, but harmonious. Dr. Hovey never spoke disparagingly of theology. He exalted it and the study of it to their proper place. To him Christian theology contained elements as permanent and unchangeable as God, which are unaffected by the conflicting thoughts of men or by the progress of the race, and the study of Christian theology was the sublimest and most beneficial occupation to which the human mind could devote itself.

As a teacher Dr. Hovey had certain characteristics which will be always remembered by those who had the inestimable privilege of sitting at his feet. Of course he carried into his class-room his profound reverence and love for the Word of God, which could not but influence the minds of his students. They were made to feel that the heart's desire and prayer to God of their teacher was, that he might know the truth and impart the truth, that he had no views, and taught no doctrines, which he did not believe to be contained in the Bible or in entire consonance with its teachings. He might possibly be in error as to the exact meaning of a passage under consideration, as he would modestly confess; but the inspired passage contained truth and not error. Man was fallible, but Christ was infallible. He honored, revered, bowed to, and loved God's Word, which to him was God's Word in no unreal sense, and his spirit was contagious. The atmosphere of his recitation-room was filled with the healthy oxygen of a devout reverence and affection for the truth of revelation. It was a place for inquiry, which he always welcomed, for honest investigation, and not for irreverent criticism. Above the teaching of human philosophy and

the conflicting testimony of human reason stood the divine Oracles. The supremacy of the Bible was an open secret in his instruction. If its doctrine tallied with the Christian consciousness, well and good. If not, then so much the worse for the consciousness. It needed more light. His students were taught that their message to men, to have convincing and saving power, must be born not of their own thinking nor of their teacher's thinking, and must come not from Newton Hill, but from high Heaven. Probably no theological Professor in this country has deplored the defection of fewer of his students from the truth than Dr. Hovey.

A second characteristic of Dr. Hovey's class-room work was his admirable candor in the treatment of opponents and opposing views. There is probably no doctrine of revealed religion which has not been subjected to open denial or to different interpretations. It is not enough that a theological professor be able to show the Scriptural basis of the doctrine he teaches, but he must be acquainted with the whole range of theological discussion, which has been going on for centuries, and bring it more or less minutely under review. His position requires not only that he teach truth, but that he oppose error, and show it to be error. He must be not only an interpreter, but a disputant. No more fair-minded, just, honorable or conscientious disputant ever entered the theological arena. The *odium theologicum* never found a place in his bosom. No man ever knew him to take advantage of an opponent's absence to misrepresent him, or to give to his language the slightest shade of meaning different from what was intended. To him every man, however divergent and erroneous his doctrine, was an honorable antagonist, and deserved to be treated honorably. He was as careful of another's error, that it be correctly stated, as he was of Christ's truth. Every man was a real man to him. He had no men of straw, and it may be said of him,

what it is to be feared cannot be said of all instructors, that he never uttered a sentence in theological discussion, to whose spirit or fairness an opponent could take any exception. Such discussion, carried on in such a spirit of Christian candor, would have saved Christendom from much of the bitterness of its theological warfare; aye, possibly would have put an end to its warfare centuries ago.

And this same spirit made our honored professor exceedingly patient in listening to the threadbare objections and arguments which fifty classes of students, each possibly a little more disputatious than the previous one, brought forward. His soul must often have been tried within him by the persistent and unreasonable attitude of those who knew so much less, and thought they knew so much more, than their venerable teacher. Yet no one ever saw the outward indication of an impatient spirit, or a disposition to shut off discussion, until the objection was fully met and answered. Sometimes we may have thought that he was a little too patient with our classmate's stupidity, if not with our own; but later reflection has produced the conviction that it was safer and wiser to err in this direction than in the opposite. At any rate, no student ever went away from his class-room with a wounded spirit, because he failed to get a hearing, or was answered in a summary manner, or with a word of biting sarcasm. Dr. Hovey could not be otherwise than considerate and kind to the humblest seeker after truth and light.

Moreover, Dr. Hovey, as a teacher, was always clear and easily comprehended. No man of average mental ability ever found it difficult to understand the meaning of his language. Clear thinking produces clear speaking. His words were as free from ambiguity as they were from extravagance of statement. Coming to the class-room with well-digested views of Biblical truth, he ex-

pressed them in a style of wonderful simplicity and directness. Even the profoundest truths of theology were so clearly outlined that no student was left in doubt as to the position which the professor held. Sometimes, undoubtedly, by reason of his very simplicity and transparency of statement, he failed to make upon some minds the impression of his true greatness. There is a mistiness, an uncertainty, an obscurity, which passes in some quarters for profundity. A distinguished college president had a brother who was a clergyman, and who impressed some persons as being a far greater man than the president. Some one, in fact, is said to have remarked to him on one occasion, "Your brother is a very profound preacher; he dives very deep." To which the president replied, "Yes, and frequently comes up muddy." With Dr. Hovey in the chair of instruction, the deep waters of theological truth were as transparent as human language could make them, and always rolled over shining sands. If there was uncertainty in the mind of the student, it was owing to the mystery of the doctrine, and not to the vagueness of the language. In a science so involved, so far-reaching, so infinite as theology, which is the science of the Incomprehensible One, whose being and "whose ways are past finding out," in which, as Peter said of Paul's letters, are some things which will always be "hard to be understood," it is a chief glory of an instructor that in what he says, he not only can be understood, but cannot be misunderstood. It may be doubted if any class, or any member of any class, ever retired from Dr. Hovey's lecture-room perplexed as to his meaning. The doctrine may have been the doctrine of God, but the language was the language of a child.

In a word Dr. Hovey ever stood in the most friendly and helpful relations to his students, winning in a remarkable degree their confidence and affection, sympathizing with them in their doubts and difficulties and in

their eager quest for truth, helping them with outstretched hand up toward the serene and sunny height of his own faith, and moulding them by the influence of his Johannine spirit and transparent character, so that they have gone forth to the Christian ministry, not only well and soundly instructed in the Word of God, which they were commissioned to preach, but better men by reason of their student-life in Newton Theological Institution, with a deeper love of all truth and a higher ideal of Christian manhood. A thousand students and more, the living who are still proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ in many lands, and the dead who are resting from their labors, and share with him the undimmed light of eternal Truth, unite to bless the memory of their beloved teacher.

AN INTERPRETATION OF HEBREWS IX.:16-17.

By PROF. D. F. ESTES, D.D.,
Hamilton Theological Seminary, Hamilton, N. Y.

THAT anything new should be said, on the passage proposed for discussion, may well seem after so much ink has been spilled upon it, extremely unlikely. That something now needs to be said will seem, in view of the hopeless variance among commentators, scarcely to need proof. The elements of the problem are neither many nor abstruse. The first question which stares in the face the would-be interpreter of this passage is, What does *διαθήκη* (usually translated 'testament') mean? In classic Greek it commonly signified a disposition of property or arrangement of affairs of one in view of death, a will or testament. In one passage which has been definitely cited (Arist. Birds, 439), perhaps in a few other instances, the meaning is that of an agreement between living persons, a covenant. Still practically the only classical meaning is 'testament.' In the Septuagint, however, it is the ordinary rendering of the Hebrew ברית, occurring nearly three hundred times in the sense of covenant, and never in the sense of testament. It would be anticipating the result of the present discussion to say that in the New Testament the word invariably has the meaning of covenant, as in the Septuagint, but it is, beyond question, the prevalent meaning. One other passage (Gal. iii. 15) is sometimes given (Thayer's Lexicon) as requiring the meaning of testament, but all the modern commentators of standing on Galatians (as Lightfoot, Ellicott, Meyer, Zoeckler) agree in excluding the definite conception of testament. If, in the passage in Hebrews, the word means testament, it stands alone in the

Greek Bible, Old Testament or New. The language of Hatch (*Essays in Bib. Greek*, p. 48), while emphatic, seems not unreasonably strong: "There can be little doubt that the word must be invariably taken in this sense of covenant in the New Testament, and especially in a book which is so impregnated with the language of the LXX. as the *Epistle to the Hebrews*."

It must, however, be granted that as the meaning testament is the ordinary signification of the word in classical Greek, it would, even though most unlikely, yet not be absolutely impossible, if it is required by the context or the sense of the passage, that it should be found here. How then does the signification testament fit into the course of the argument?

It is recognized, even by those who advocate the rendering testament, that it does not fit into the context so well as does covenant. The whole discussion for some time before and after is a comparison of covenants.

In the preceding chapter the "new covenant" is set forth in the words of Jeremiah as promised and defined. In the ninth chapter the author sets forth the better sanctuary and better blood of the new covenant. To break up the steady flow of the argument by discussion of the promise of God as being in effect a testament would be, to say the least, aside from the argument. The attempt to explain the sudden shift of meaning is nowhere more plausibly made than by Kendrick (*Comm. on Hebrews*), who says "The idea of an inheritance, so prominent in the Old Testament, and just mentioned suggests a transition from a 'covenant' to a 'testament.' This transition is made all the more easily and, indeed, almost imperceptibly, as it is but a gliding over to the more common meaning of the word before rendered 'covenant' as then the blessings bestowed by God upon his people are spoken of both as matters of agreement and of inheritance, and as in both cases a death was equally essential

to the validity of the arrangement, it is not strange that the author should slide in his usage from one to the other. I may add that the transition, which seems harsh in our language, which has not a common word, attracts no special notice from the Greek interpreters, who take it as a matter of course." Another phase of this view, if no more plausible, yet more scientific in form, is to be found in Thayer's Lexicon, where we read "Finally must be noted the amphiboly or twofold use [cf. Philo de mut. nom. sec. 6] by which the writer to the Hebrews, in IX. 16 sq., substitutes for the meaning *covenant* which *διαθήκη* bears elsewhere in the Ep. that of *testament*." But such a change from the idea of covenant to that of testament robs the passage of all argumentative value. Luenemann clearly recognized this and frankly confessed it, saying, "To be sure, that *διαθήκη* is used here in these two verses in a quite different sense from its use before and after, is a logical inaccuracy, and what the author adduces, although the ideas which serve as its basis are themselves quite correct, yet loses its force as a formal demonstration." When Hofmann, with whom Von Soden seems substantially to agree, attempts to give a wider meaning to *διαθήκη*, as, for instance, that of arrangement, there is no real gain in clearness. As Weiss puts it (Comm. Heb. 1888, p. 231), "It remains that the author is playing on the ambiguity of *διαθήκη*, but it is certainly absolutely unthinkable that this should have betrayed him into a logical inconsequence or inaccuracy (Theol., Bl., de W., Luen., Moeller), since in fact by that all real connection of thought would cease. Such a play on words is only justified when the covenant can at the same time be regarded as a bequest of Christ which goes into force only after his death." So Weiss himself attempts to evade the difficulty by the assertion that the new covenant is really at the same time a bequest. Kuebel takes substantially the same view saying that

Christ is at the same time testator and mediator of the new covenant, and "thus," he says, "there is no empty trifling with the two-fold significance of διαθήκη." But there is just as much incoherence of thought in arguing from what Christ is in one aspect of his work to what he is in another as there would be in arguing from one sense of an ambiguous word to the other. As Edwards put it in a way which he did not answer, even if in some sense he retracted the general conclusion (Exp., Third Ser., III. 374): "It must first be shown, to make the argument anything better than a childish equivocation, that God's promises are in any real sense a testamentary disposition. Christ's death is necessary, according to the unvarying representations of the New Testament, in consequence of man's guilt, and bears no resemblance of any kind to the act of a person who makes a bequest of his goods and chattels to his heirs." Edwards later (Exp. Bib.) regarded the statement as only an illustration: "We can not suppose that it was intended to be anything more." But the impossibility of this view is clearly shown by the misrepresentation of the course of thought which follows. He says: "To return to argument, the blood of Christ may be shown to have ratified a covenant from the use of blood by Moses to inaugurate the former covenant." But instead of the phrase, "to return to argument," the author of Hebrews says (v. 18) "Ὁθεν, wherefore, a word implying a close logical relation, showing that he thought that he had been arguing all the time. The rest of the letter shows logical power and ability to recognize distinctions. It is unfair to tax such an author with incoherence in arguing from an illustration, or in arguing from one aspect of Christ's work to another, or from one aspect of the promise of God to another, or from one sense of the word to another, whether you call it trifling ("Spielerei") or call it "amphiboly."

If the signification covenant is not made necessary by

uniform biblical usage it is certainly natural if not necessary here, and it now appears that the context and course of argument demand the sense covenant. Is there any thing in the passage itself which constrains us to seek another sense? Kuebel and Von Soden assert the other sense without hint of their reasons for so doing. Kendrick merely remarks "That the transition [from covenant to testament] is actually made, I see no sufficient grounds to deny. Without it verses 16 and 17 are extremely harsh and unmeaning." Luenemann says: "The thought that for the validity of a covenant the death of the maker thereof must previously happen is wholly meaningless." Weiss, in rare conformity to his predecessor in the Meyer Commentary echoes him thus: "The attempts to take *διαθήκη* here too in the sense of covenant (Cramer, Paulus, Ebrard, following older) are quite idle since the assertion that the covenant first comes in force through the death [of the maker] is simply meaningless." Delitzsch perhaps gives the clue to the origin of this prevalent exegetical tradition when he naively remarks "*Διαθήκη* is here evidently taken in the sense of *testamentum*.". Hatch remarks (Essays, p. 48), "In ignorance of the philology of the later and vulgar Latin, it was formerly supposed that 'testamentum,' by which the word [*διαθήκη*] is rendered in the early Latin versions as well as in the Vulgate, meant 'testament' or 'will,' whereas in fact it meant also, if not exclusively, 'covenant.'" The definition of *testamentum* given in the Hackett-Smith Bible Dictionary on the authority of DuCange Glossarium is "An authoritative solemn decree or document." This misunderstanding of this Latin word is quite likely the chief source of the notion of the change of meaning from covenant to will.

The view that the author shifts in his thought from covenant to testament has been confirmed by the fact that no unobjectionable interpretation of the passage on the

basis of covenant, has yet been proposed. If one can be found which is not "meaningless," then the biblical usage and the demands of the context will prevail, and we must read it covenant. Some attempts have been made to reach a solution by modification of the meaning of the words *ὁ διαθέμενος* so that they should refer to the appointed victim, but such endeavors manifestly put an intolerable strain on the language.

Rendall (Ep. to the Heb.) presents his idea in the following paraphrase: "Where a covenant is made, death of him that makes it must be the forfeit offered. For a covenant is ratified upon dead victims: for is it strong at a time (reading *μὴ τότε*) when he that makes it lives *after breaking it?*" But the author of Hebrews does not present the death of Christ as a penalty for anybody's breaking the covenant, but as an indispensable condition of making a covenant. Ebrard holds that "when a sinner enters into covenant with the holy God he must first atone for his guilt by death or offer a substitutionary offering." But the statement of verse 16 is absolutely general. It is a familiar principle to those whom the author addresses that the death of the one making a *διαθήκη* must be represented in order that it should have validity. And also this principle applies to both parties. In this part of the discussion there is no suggestion of a substitutionary sacrifice. The thought is simple: In order to make a covenant death is essential. To be sure, the death of Christ which gave validity to the new covenant was also an atoning and substitutionary death. To be sure, this aspect of Christ's death is brought out in verse 15, where it is said that for his mediatorship he must die to redeem from the transgressions which had occurred under the first covenant. But this would not necessarily militate against the view that the death of Christ found additional place and use in the simple sealing and ratification of the new covenant. This aspect of the efficacy of the death

of Christ only Westcott (Ep. to the Heb.) seems to have apprehended and set forth with clearness and force.

The general statement made with such distinctness and positiveness as to the validity of covenants is not intelligible to us except in the light of a custom which is now only historic and which may rest upon ideas which are foreign to us. A covenant was anciently made, sometimes at least, by the passing of the parties between the pieces of an animal which had been killed and divided. While the instances of this are not numerous they are sufficient to convince that this was a familiar method. The expression for making an agreement כרת ברית with its Greek and Latin parallels, ὅρκια τέμνειν, τέμνειν σπονδάς, *percutere foedus*, can be explained on this basis if not indeed only on this basis. In the time of Jeremiah (Jer. chap. xxxiv) a solemn agreement was made that the Hebrew slaves should be emancipated, and this agreement was made by the passing between the parts of slain calves. A still more familiar example of this practice is seen in Genesis (chap. xv), when God makes his first great promise to Abraham, and in the midst of dense darkness a smoking furnace and a flaming torch pass between the pieces. There was in this case no common passing between the pieces, but, as Dillmann says, "Only God passed through, because he only had here anything to promise." Now it is to be noted, first, that this operation of killing and parting animals is not, as Fuerst and others say, a sacrifice, because, as Dillmann again remarks, "The pieces did not come upon the altar," "though," he adds, "perhaps where only men are concerned in the agreement a real sacrifice was also offered."

Delitzsch further calls attention to the fact that among the Greeks and Romans "the pieces of the animals were neither burned in honor of God, nor partially eaten, but were buried or thrown into the water, and to partake of them was interdicted because a curse rested on them."

Also it is not necessarily true that the thought which lay at the basis of the rite was what Knobel and many others, including *Encyc. Bibl.*, (Art. "Covenant,") put into it, namely, an implied invocation that the breakers of the covenant might suffer as these animals suffered. To be sure this interpretation of the form is as old as Livy and Josephus, and has generation after generation held unquestioned possession of the field, but in these iconoclastic days that counts for little in argument. If it is possible for mistake to have arisen respecting history and authorship, still more is it possible that at a still greater distance of time the purport of ancient ceremonies should have been misconceived.

It is possible that the purport of the covenant in death should thus be conceived. While a man lives he can change his mind. Only the dead have lost the power of action and opportunity to change. To make a permanent and changelessly valid covenant the covenanter must die, symbolically at least. "Go to, now," the parties agreeing seem to say, "we will change no more than if we were dead. We are, so far as this matter is concerned, already dead. Let us each take an animal, or, for economy, let us both take one, let us kill it, let us divide it and pass between the parts, thus appropriating the symbol to ourselves. Thus though living we shall be bound in the cords of death." It is not possible to demonstrate that this could not have been the original significance of the parted animals. But for the interpretation of the letter to the Hebrews it is not necessary to show that it is even a probable explanation of the ancient rite. It need only be shown that this explanation fits with the language of the author and thus plausibly explains his teaching. If he may have held it, that is enough for the purpose of the present discussion.

If this thought is read into his discussion it relieves much of the difficulty. In particular it squares wonder-

fully with certain peculiar phrases. He says that the death of the maker must needs *φέρεσθαι*, not take place, *γίνεσθαι*, just be brought forward *φέρεσθαι*, a very fit phrase for a symbolic representation of death, but utterly unintelligible for actual death. Then the *διαθήκη* is said to be valid only *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς*, a strange expression if the persons were supposed to be really dead, and thus removed from the relations of life, a very fit expression if those covenanting were merely considered to have become symbolically dead.

What then is the course of argument? In the making of every covenant it is essential that the death of the parties should be represented by the slain animal, the death of which they assume as their own by passing between the pieces. For a covenant is valid only when thus ratified and binds only those who have thus ratified it. While they live, that is, till they ratify it by a symbolic death, they are free to change their mind and action. This made it necessary that the first covenant should be ratified with blood. Of course it was impossible that God on the one hand, the nation on the other, should actually pass between the symbolic pieces. But the blood of the animals was taken and divided into two equal parts, one for each of the parties. That for the people was sprinkled upon them, that for God was dashed upon the altar and sprinkled upon the tent of meeting and whatever might stand for God.

It should be noted that this view differs from the ordinary view as to the worth of the blood which inaugurated the old covenant. It is not at all as set forth by Oehler (*Theol. of O. T.*, Eng. Trans., Am. Ed., p. 264), for example, blood of "sacrifice," of "consecration," "atoning" for the people, and "the sprinkling of the altar," signifying not merely "God's acceptance of the blood" but at the same time "consecration of the place in which Jehovah enters into intercourse with his people," and "the

sprinkling of the people signifies an *appropriation* of the people on God's part." Be it remembered that this whole theory is not spun merely of brittle glass, it is spun of air. No word of Scripture requires it or really countenances it. Why should one-half of the blood signify acceptance, the other half appropriation? It is naturally to be supposed that the sprinkling of each half means the same thing, ratification.

If this is the sense of the blood of the old covenant Christ's blood of the new covenant, called by himself the "blood of the covenant," in the symbolic cup becomes newly significant. It is not only blood of sacrifice, of purification, of atonement, it is in addition to all these blood of inauguration, of ratification of the new covenant, blood which binds in mutual covenant and pledge God on the one side and men on the other.

PREACHING AS A FACTOR IN CIVILIZATION.

BY PROFESSOR E. C. DARGAN, D.D., LL.D.

CIVILIZATION may be shortly described as human progress toward better conditions. Movement implies force, and the forces of civilization are many and various. No one force, and no cluster of forces, can be safely assumed as primary, essential or predominant in the production and maintenance of the great complex process of civilization. It will be readily granted, however, that one of the greatest and most distinctive forces of the civilization which we know best is Christianity—its facts, doctrines, institutions. And the connection of all these with preaching is obvious. For preaching is the proclamation and teaching of Christian truth and duty. It is not the only mode of this propagation, but it is one of the best known and effective modes. If the Christian religion is a factor in civilization, so then is preaching.

It is, however, a notable fact that preaching has not received at the hands of historians, philosophers and literary men the recognition which it deserves as a force in Western civilization past and present. This neglect may be due in part to the fact that preaching is taken for granted as one of the units in the sum of Christian forces; or it may also in part be due to certain prejudices to which the preacher and his calling are commonly exposed. But this comparative neglect does not call for any strained or extraordinary exertions to vindicate the place of the pulpit in the history of Christian civilization. The place itself is assured, and is easily enough pointed out. Nor are we at all required to exaggerate the claims of preaching or to depreciate in the least those of any other

civilizing force. All that is needed is a simple presentation of facts. To this end the following topics are proposed for brief discussion: Points of contact between preaching and civilization; Outline of the history of preaching.

POINTS OF CONTACT BETWEEN PREACHING AND CIVILIZATION.

As in the cases of art and literature it should go without saying that the relation between preaching, as one of the most important kinds of public speech, and civilization, has been and remains one of large reciprocal influence. Preaching has influenced the times, and the times have influenced preaching, and this throughout all history since the preaching of Christianity became a considerable force in the social life of mankind. In this give-and-take there has naturally been more and less according to circumstances. There are times when preaching has been more active than passive, and the other way. The points of contact between the Christian pulpit and the developing civilized life of the West are many and important. A few may be recalled.

The most remote point of connection comes up first: that of political and ethnic affairs. But the names of Paul, of Chrysostom, Ambrose and Augustine, of Boniface, Bernard and Francis, of Luther, Calvin and Knox, of Whitefield, Wesley and Edwards, not to speak of others, are a few of those which remind us that in different ages and in widely various ways preachers have often been instrumental in turning the life and thoughts of nations and peoples into new paths.

It is at the point of culture, however, that the contact of preaching with civilization is more apparent and direct. Art, philosophy and science have given and received in contact with the Christian pulpit. More especially has this been true in the realm of letters and education. Language is the preacher's instrument, and his practical and

scientific services to philology have been neither few nor slight. Literature, both religious and secular, has been the constant companion of the pulpit. The give-and-take between it and preaching is inestimable alike in sum and in value. Education in all its branches has poured out its treasures for the service of the preacher, and the pulpit has acknowledged and paid the debt by being in all lands and under many trying times the earnest and devoted champion of educational progress. In our own country the number of preachers who have been college presidents and professors is matter of common fame, and the thousands of pastors who by word and deed have contributed to every phase of the educational progress of our country passes enumeration. The founding, patronage, endowment, and shaping the policy of institutions of learning have been and remain a most important part of the service of the preacher to the cause of human progress.

It only remains to say that of course the chief way in which preaching has contributed to civilization is in its proclamation and teaching of the Christian religion. The matters hitherto discussed are obviously incidental and subsidiary to this main work, important as they are in themselves and in their relations to the general progress of mankind. The historical outline which is to follow will make more apparent this phase of our subject, but here in a preliminary way it will be desirable to set before us the principal ways in which preaching as an essential means and element of Christianity has exerted its civilizing function.

First of all, preaching has always been a direct and fruitful means in the extension of Christianity. The missionary and the evangelist have ever been among the most valuable and influential of Christian preachers. No age, not even the darkest ones, has been without the witness of these devoted and useful heralds of the Cross. From land to land and from people to people they have gone

with their message of salvation by faith in Christ. In fact we may say that the history of the propagation of Christianity is largely the history of preaching. And what is true of the extension of Christianity among peoples unacquainted with it, is also true of its further spread and confirmation among those to whom it has been brought. The leavening of the Christian nations with the truth, and the maintenance of the institutions of Christianity among them have been largely, though of course not exclusively, the work of the pulpit. And other methods of Christian work have received constant impetus, instruction and help of every kind from the preacher. The conversion of men to Christ, one by one, whether by personal appeal or public speech, is the constant and continuous factor in the preservation and progress of Christianity. A live and vigorous pulpit is the almost invariable accompaniment and part cause of large ingathering to the churches.

The other part of the pulpit's work, that of edification or instruction, is almost equally important with that of propagation of the truth. From the first this has been one of the main elements of preaching, and this must ever remain true. The building up of the church in the truths and morals of the gospel is one of the pulpit's most sacred and indispensable functions. And in every age, as we shall see, it has right nobly addressed itself to this great task. While writing of every sort, and the daily example of the Christian life have been and continue to be of unspeakable value in the teaching of truth and duty, it is also impossible to estimate the worth of the preacher in every age as a teacher of the best things in the life that now is, and in that which is to come. And this is true in spite of the sad fact that preachers have not by any means always practised what they preached, but have often, alas! been unworthy messengers for their King. On the other hand, the most savage critic must admit that for

the preacher's message the reinforcement of excellent character has not been usually lacking. The annals of the world on the whole show no finer specimens of splendid and influential character than are to be found among the preachers of the gospel.

The great movements of religion through the ages, the rise and fall of Christian enterprises, the revivals and declensions of fervor in faith and works, the progress of educational, philanthropic, reformatory measures, all have found their reflection, and often their motive force in the work of the preacher. In fact the sum of the spiritual contribution of the Christian faith to the betterment of mankind is so wrapped up in the work of the pulpit that it cannot be separated. As an established and permanent institution of Christianity preaching abides a living and active force in maintaining and improving the civilization of our own time. It is as much as it ever was intimately connected with all that Christianity represents in the life and history of the nations among whom that religion has sway. Deriving its origin from the direct appointment of God, preaching has an assured foundation of vitality and power. Preaching is the heir of its own past, and by virtue of its inherited traditions and character it abides a respectable and influential force among the higher spiritual agencies of our time.

In regard to the visible and tangible effects of preaching upon life and events, while we may speak with the certitude of reasoned conviction from phenomena that cannot be disputed, we ought at the same time to speak with candor and caution. But when every proper allowance and qualification is duly regarded, the fact remains that no complete account can be taken of the actual results and fruitage of the pulpit's work. None of those forces which may be called in a general way spiritual—whether in art, literature, science, or other department of intellectual power; or whether in example, custom, law or other

mode of moral guidance—can be estimated by linear or cubic measure, or in pounds and bushels. But we know that these things affect life and mould civilization. Some of the fruits of preaching we see in the rescue of men and women from sin, in the training of youth in purity and righteousness, in the championship of projects for benevolence and reform. But not even these things do or can tell the whole story of the pulpit's contribution to the maintenance and furtherance of all that we count most worthy to be sought after and perpetuated in the civilized life of to-day. All that has been said can be illustrated and enforced by a view, however cursory, of the history of preaching.

OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF PREACHING.

For convenience of memory and discussion the nineteen centuries of Christian preaching may be divided and arranged into six periods of varying length. The first century, embracing the ministry of our Lord and his apostles with their fellow-workers, may be properly called the Originative Period. The next five centuries (A. D. 100 to 600) may be designated the Patristic, or Formative, Period. After that comes the early mediaeval period, or Dark Ages (A. D. 600 to 1100), which with only too much justice may be denominated the Decadent Period. But with the Crusades and Scholasticism came a new breath of life into preaching, and the centuries from 1100 to 1400 may be characterized as the Period of the Catholic Revival. Decline in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries prepared for and in a sense necessitated reform in the pulpit as well as in the church generally, so that we may include both the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries under the Reformatory Period (1400-1600). This leaves us to put the last three centuries (1600-1900) under the Modern Period, or with some qualifications understood, the Period of Protestant Evangelism.

In the first century, the originative period, Christian preaching was established as a force in the world by the work and appointment of the Founder of Christianity. Its essential character was also fixed for all time. This was the proclamation of the gospel of Christ, and the moral and spiritual instruction of all who believed in it. This twofold function constitutes the distinctive nature of preaching as one of the forms of public speaking, and with its introduction among the elements of human culture a new and vigorous religious force is inaugurated, and a new era in human history begins.

At this epoch the heart of civilization was the cluster of countries in Asia, Africa and Europe which skirted or penetrated the Mediterranean Sea. Politically they were held together in the great Roman Empire. The predominant elements of their culture were Grecian and Roman, but there was a mingling of other influences, among which must be reckoned the Jewish. In these countries at the end of the first Christian century we find at all the great centers of influence, and also at many places of less importance, communities of Christian believers called churches. These groups of believers had many features which distinguished them from the numerous sodalities and guilds which were characteristic of the age, one of which was the utilizing of their assemblies as occasions not only for worship but for proclaiming the facts and teaching the doctrines of the Christian faith, in other words for preaching. And so within these assemblies for Christian worship was established and exercised that ministry of the word of God purposed by Christ and destined to become and remain one of the moulding influences in all subsequent social human life.

The influence and actual results of preaching in this first age of its history doubtless seemed slight to any philosophers, teachers, or other leaders of thought who may have chanced or deigned to take notice of this new claim-

ant for place among the things that lead men to higher degrees of being. Yet in nature and extent the influence of this new force for culture was coterminous with that of Christianity as a whole, in which as a part it was characteristic and essential. In the work of Jesus and his followers preaching won men to the new faith and instructed them in its inspiring truths and lofty morals. It told to men the foulness of sin and the worth of the remedy for it that God had provided in the gift of his Only-Begotten Son to be the Saviour of the world. It taught the virtues of a true spiritual life; it proclaimed the love and the nearness as well as the holiness and the grandeur of God; it declared the certainty of judgment upon sin and of reward for righteousness in a life beyond the grave; it freely offered the hope of everlasting life to all who would accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. Within the circle of its influence the preaching of the gospel in part accepted and in part overthrew, while it wholly uplifted and purified current and established principles of morality. But it added to this firm grasp and clear enunciation of accepted and eternal truth, ideas and motives of its own, which came like the breath of new life among the dry bones of conventional ethics. It exalted and encouraged the strivings of men after righteousness by a sense of the divine nearness and approval, and by the example of an unique and perfect manhood; and it fixed their hopes of a future and endless life with God by a new and glorious argument—the advent, life, death, resurrection, present glory and future return of the Son of God.

The next period, the patristic or formative, extends from the close of the labors of the Apostles and their immediate successors down to the pontificate of Gregory the Great, 590-604, or, in even numbers, from A. D. 100 to 600. In the world's general history this period witnessed the widest extent and the most flourishing administration of the Roman Empire, but likewise its decay, division,

and the fall of the West. It was the age of the great Teutonic invasions which altered the course of history, and amid turmoil and confusion planted the seeds of mediæval and modern European civilization. Yet in this very time, when the ancient world had come to its height of power and was tottering to its fall, Christianity, through contempt, opposition, and even fierce persecution, displaces the senile polytheism of antiquity and becomes the only real and vigorous religious force within the Empire. It even becomes the religion of the state, the popular cult, and suffers corruption from the patronage of the world. Its very success becomes its snare, but none the less is its place amid the mighty powers that have guided the course of events secured for all time.

Preaching shares in these great movements of the age, and that both for good and ill. Its position, its character, its influence upon thought and life are all bound up in the general fortunes of the age. While it holds its place as a peculiar and permanent element of Christian worship, and retains its character as the principal means of proclaiming and teaching Christian truth, it undergoes important modifications in details which profoundly and permanently affect both its inner being and its outward form and position.

Along with the gospel tradition the exposition of Scripture is now relatively more important, for the reason that while the things handed down from apostles and elders become more dim and more mingled with accretions and perversions, the written Word becomes fixed in the canon of the New Testament, and these writings added to those of the Old Testament are accepted as the authoritative expression of the mind and will of God. Thus the whole Bible comes to be recognized and established as the storehouse from which the principal and the authoritative contents of preaching are drawn. At the same time, then as always, there must be taken into account the personal

contribution of the individual preacher in the expression of his own thinking, feeling and culture. And thus in these traditional, Scriptural and personal ingredients we have the enduring contents of preaching. Through all after ages they continue, receiving such proportionate combination, relative prominence and particular handling as will be given to them in different times, among different schools, and by different men.

In form likewise the Christian discourse follows the law of providential historic evolution. It first develops as exposition of Scripture by piecemeal but continuous comment, under the name of homily, or talk. In the Alexandrian school, especially under the influence of the great scholar and teacher Origen, this manner of preaching is in the third century brought to its height, but is at the same time unhappily marred by the excessive use of strained allegorical interpretation. With some brilliant exceptions, this method became the prevalent one till the Reformation, nor indeed has it ever been wholly laid aside. With the interpretation of Scripture, apologetic and speculative elements of thought give to these homilies more or less the character of philosophic discourses, while the influence of the rhetorical culture so prevalent in that age is seen in the oratorical development which reached its highest point in Basil and the two Gregories and John Chrysostom in the East, and somewhat less markedly in Ambrose, Augustine and Leo in the West.

Scarcely less important than these matters of content and form is the place of preaching in Christian worship. Already firmly and finally fixed in that position, it receives important modification by the growth of Christianity and its recognition as the religion of the Empire. If this tends to formality and display it also advances the oratorical character of preaching and secures for it in society both greater dignity and wider influence.

We must also notice the office and personality of the

preacher. All the things previously mentioned combined to make the preacher a man of influence in church and society. Officialism and state patronage did much harm and were overruled to some good. Weak human nature in the ministry, then as ever since, too often fell victim to the seductions of worldliness and ambition. Places were sought and abused; designing men, unfit and unscrupulous, sometimes filled the office of the preacher, and with the growth and grading of ecclesiastical offices and powers, presbyters, bishops and prelates of still higher rank became persons of distinction in the community. With all the evils of this condition of affairs there were some compensating advantages. Good and great men, like Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose and Augustine, and a host of others just as good though less great, had places wherein character and abilities such as theirs could be made to tell with powerful and salutary effect on both contemporary and subsequent thought and life.

As to the visible effects of preaching in this formative period we can say that in case of the popular preachers great crowds attended the sermon; that many souls were saved for heaven and many lives redeemed and ennobled for earth; that literature became pervaded with Christian thought and feeling; that government and society were touched and more or less moulded by Christian sentiment; and that in all this the pulpit was a living and effective force.

At the death of Gregory the Great in 604 the last great figure among the church fathers disappears, and we enter the decadent period (600 to 1100) of preaching. It is the darkest and lowest stage in the history of the Christian pulpit. Nothing of permanent value was contributed to the development either of the sermon as a product or of preaching as a force. Almost the sole element of real life was the missionary preaching of such men as Columba, Columban, Gall, Willibrord, Boniface,

Ansgar, and their colaborers and followers. Next to this the cloistral preaching, or instructions to the monks and nuns, showed signs of life, and these two kept going somewhat, albeit to different congregations, the two essentials of preaching—proclamation and instruction. The regular parochial preaching where the two may be combined in normal relation had fallen into dreadful and shameful neglect. Parish priests were the poorest preachers of all, and this continued to be the case for ages. Little or no remains of pulpit literature survive from that time, and what little there is is of very inferior quality. The best, as is natural, are the cloistral homilies, and these are notoriously and chiefly plagiarisms from the fathers, destitute of originality and absurd with allegorizing of Scripture and retailing of legends.

Yet weak as preaching was in itself, it only shared, as usual, the general character of the time. In those decadent and confused centuries of European life everything had fallen into the consumption, and preaching caught it. In relation to the progress of the age it maintained its position. Some of the best thought of the age found expression in preaching, which was still the principal means of religious evangelism and instruction, and by keeping its character during this barren time it was an important factor in preserving and passing on such intellectual and spiritual culture as there was. The praiseworthy even if mechanical and crude efforts of certain bishops and of Charlemagne and his successors in the eighth and ninth centuries to revive and improve preaching show both how low it had sunk, and how highly it was still valued for what it had been and might again become.

The next great period, that of the Catholic revival, from 1100 to 1400, attained its culmination in the thirteenth century, but was coming on in the twelfth, and declined in the fourteenth. It is a great mistake to set down

these three great centuries as on a par with the darker times immediately preceding and reckon the whole so-called Middle Ages as one dead level of decay and stagnation. On the contrary in all departments of European civilization there was remarkable vigor, and in this heightened life preaching bore its full share in both giving and receiving aid and stimulus.

In the preaching of the period there was no loss of previously acquired character and influence, but retention of all it had inherited from the past, with decided improvement in quality, power and effect. It still held a position of honor in Christian worship, though long subordinate to the mass as the central thing in the service; it was still the leading means of making known and inculcating Christian truth and duty, with vast accession of force and considerable improvement in contents. It is true that the allegorical method of interpretation prevailed in its wildest extremes, that saints' tales and other legends of marvel and miracle occupied too much space, that traditional and wholly unscriptural additions and perversions fearfully marred and obscured the purity of Christian teaching; but the fundamental facts and doctrines of Christianity and its moral principles were proclaimed and enforced.

Besides this retention of the general functions of preaching, there may be specified some of the more direct ways in which it was felt as a factor in mediaeval civilization. All the world knows something of the connection of preaching with the Crusades. The eloquent address of Pope Urban II. at the council of Clermont in 1095 precipitated that great movement, and the fiery harangues of Peter the Hermit aroused a gale of religious devotion, sadly mingled as it was with warlike and superstitious elements. Other notable preachers of crusades were Radulph the Ardent and the great Bernard of Clairvaux, not to speak of others less known. This preaching had its ob-

vious faults of purpose, method, contents, motive and results, but with all this it did in a way appeal to religious as well as to adventurous and superstitious feeling, and the power of such appeal over the minds of men was signally displayed. Never perhaps has the tremendous effect of popular religious eloquence, when it comes to its own generation with a live even if mistaken message, been so clearly demonstrated as in this crusading preaching.

The distinctive intellectual movement of this age was scholasticism, which was the effort of powerful minds to conceive, correlate and state the current Catholic doctrines in the forms of dialectic philosophy. Overstrained as were its methods and barren as were many of its results, scholasticism was nevertheless a prodigious intellectual and religious force, and its influence both upon contemporary and subsequent thought was undeniably great. Its relation to preaching was most intimate. The great *Doctor Angelicus*, Aquinas himself, was a preacher gladly heard by all classes; but not a few of the other scholastics were also popular and influential in the pulpit. Besides the diffusion of the scholastic theology among the people, pulpit literature of that and all following times shows deep and lasting traces of the scholastic analysis.

Hardly less influential in Christian life and thinking has been the mediaeval mysticism. Bernard in the twelfth century, Bonaventura in the thirteenth, and Eckhart and Tauler in the fourteenth, were in their different ways preachers of rare powers and extensive influence. These men and their pupils and imitators preached in their corrupt times holy raptures and sweet communion with God, and with all their faults and onesidedness they exerted then and have left behind them forever an influence for holiness and peace.

Along with the high thinkers and the pious mystics we must not forget the great popular preachers of these

times, who, combining some traits of scholastic thought and mystic devotion, were chiefly active and notable as preachers to the masses. It was not the crusading evangelists alone who drew crowds and stirred the people with religious enthusiasm. Francis and Dominic gathered, inspired and perpetuated the two great preaching orders of the Roman church. Among both of these there were many preachers of renown and influence, but the palm for overpowering popular eloquence during the thirteenth century rests with the two Franciscans, Antony of Padua and Berthold of Regensburg, the former working chiefly in France and Italy, the latter in Germany. These men drew immense crowds wherever they came preaching, and though we must regard the estimates of sixty and a hundred thousand hearers as exaggerations, they testify to the wonderful popularity of the preachers and the effect of earnest preaching. Notwithstanding their errors of doctrine and their faults of interpretation, they boldly and keenly denounced sin in all classes and held up Christ as the Saviour. As an incidental thing of interest and value, we should recall that these popular preachers used the language of the peoples to whom they spoke, and thus their preaching had much to do with forming and dignifying the yet crude dialects which were afterwards in more refined and settled forms to contain and express the literature of Europe.

The reformatory period (1400-1600) reached its height in the sixteenth century, but as early as Wiclif in the fourteenth and Huss at the turn into the fifteenth, the voice of the reformer was heard. Nor were these alone. Others too denounced the corruptions of church and clergy, some with bitter satire and some with deep and tender grief, till the powerful voice of Savonarola toward the end of the fifteenth century sounded forth in terrible and prophetic eloquence. In Germany also John Geiler and

others were heard before Luther preaching the call to reform.

We need not disparage by comparison any great force for progress that marked the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Free and full recognition is given to the literary and artistic renaissance, to the beginnings of modern scientific discovery, to the marvelous expansion of commerce, and to the important political movements which marked that wonderful time of passage from mediaeval to modern Europe. All these things pulsed in the heart of the time, and preaching throbbed with the excitement of the age and took its place of right among the great forces of advancing civilization. How large and potent a place that is the history of the Reformation abundantly shows. In that momentous movement preaching was one of the prime factors, and so well is this understood that only brief mention is needed here to recall the fact.

The Reformation was primarily a protest against churchly corruption, that is chiefly against unsound doctrine and unfit living in the clergy. Its mainspring was recurrence to a purer Biblical teaching, and hence to a better interpretation and use of the word of God. Thus preaching itself became more respected and powerful as soon as it began to deal at first hand and more worthily with the source of its inspiration, authority and power. This improved method of dealing with Scripture is naturally more apparent in the Protestant preaching, but by influence and rivalry it appears also in that of the Catholics. And so it is true that in all Europe preaching had a new birth in the sixteenth century, and became more perhaps than it ever had been—certainly on a broader scale—an instrument of power in moulding the thoughts and conduct of men.

To form some estimate of that work of preaching we need only name the great reformers, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Latimer, Knox, and to remember that these

great leaders and the men who worked with them were first and mainly preachers, and by preaching did the most and the best of their work. What part the reformers played in national life, and what effect their labors had in the spheres of philosophy and literature are important indeed, but after all merely incidental. They were diligent preachers of the word of God, and did not fail to magnify their office.

The modern period (1600-1900) embraces the last three centuries. Declining the attempt to gather under any distinctive generalization the many great and various features of the preaching of the age, we may content ourselves with simply following the order of the centuries as we notice briefly a few of the more salient points in the pulpit history of the different countries in which preaching has done its work.

During the seventeenth century in southern Europe there was no Protestant preaching to speak of, but among the few Catholic preachers of any fame may be mentioned the names of Segneri in Italy and of Vieyra in Portugal and far Brazil. But the great scene of Catholic preaching was France in the brilliant times of Louis XIV., when flourished the mighty masters of pulpit oratory, Bossuet, Fenelon, Bourdaloue, Massillon and others. In this time the Protestants also had worthy representatives in Claude and DuBosc before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and in the noble Saurin among the exiles.

In Germany one Catholic, Abraham of St. Clara, in Vienna, attracted wide notice. Among Protestants the natural reaction from the Reformation in the latter part of the sixteenth century, and the blight of the Thirty Years' War in the early part of the seventeenth century brought preaching very low, but it still did something to preserve the principles of the Reformation and keep alive the embers of former fires. The best preaching was

done toward the end of the seventeenth century by the Pietists, Spener, Francke, and others.

But it is when we come to Protestant England in the tumultuous seventeenth century that we find preaching to be more influential in the national life than in that of any other people of the time. Notwithstanding the turmoils of parties and the horrors of civil wars and revolutions, the English pulpit of that age made itself heard amid the hubbub of voices and the clash of arms, and left upon all parts of the national life profound and lasting impress. Great churchmen like Taylor and Barrow and South, great Puritans like Owen and Howe and Baxter, made this an era of strong and fruitful preaching. In Scotland too there were a few like Rutherford and Dickson, and in America some of the best of the Puritans were laying the strong foundations of Christian civilization in New England.

The eighteenth century, with the great exceptions of the English and American revivals, marked the lowest level of power and effect which the pulpit has reached in modern times. Decline and deadness were almost universal. Among the Catholics there were only a few preachers of note anywhere. Protestant Germany lay dormant with the torpor of rationalism, and the French Protestant pulpit also suffered under the same deadening influence. England, Scotland and even America fell in some degree under the same blight. It was truly a fearful time for religion in all its institutions and activities. Of course preaching sympathized with the dull and cold moral and religious life of the age, and for the most part was lifeless, formal and fruitless.

The one great and glorious exception to this mournful general rule is found in the preaching of Whitefield and Wesley and their associates in England, and in that of Edwards and Whitefield and their associates in America. The work of these men was distinctly and almost solely

a work of preaching. Whatever else came in their way was subsidiary and incidental; preaching was their business and their instrument of success. Of the revival under Wesley and Whitefield in England, John Richard Green writes: "In the nation at large appeared a new moral enthusiasm, which, rigid and pedantic as it often seemed, was still healthy in its social tone, and whose power was seen in the disappearance of the profligacy which had disgraced the upper classes, and the foulness which had infested literature ever since the restoration. A new philanthropy reformed our prisons, infused clemency and wisdom into our penal laws, abolished the slave trade, and gave the first impulse to popular education." Other writers put it even more strongly than this, and assert that the Wesleyan revival was nothing short of a second Reformation for England, and that the national greatness of the nineteenth century was in no small degree due to that movement.

In our own country the effects of the Great Awakening under the preaching of Jonathan Edwards, Whitefield, the Tennents and others, were scarcely less salutary and far reaching. The improved tone of moral and religious life, the diffusion of religious principles and fervor among the people, the foundation of churches and denominations, and many of the characteristics of American religious life and preaching were among the things brought about or greatly advanced by the revival. And so while preaching was at a low ebb in the eighteenth century it is yet true that this time of weakness and decline witnessed in two of the leading nations (then one) of the world, and at a critical time of their history, one of the most valuable contributions that preaching has ever made to the welfare of nations and the general cause of Christian civilization.

The nineteenth century, from which we have so recently emerged, will doubtless continue to be regarded by

other generations as well as that which has shared its greatest triumphs, as the crown of all the ages which led up to it and made it possible. Preaching in the nineteenth century walked easily abreast of the best culture and liveliest energy of that mighty time. It not only held its place as an essential part of Christian life and work, and thus was identified with all that Christianity stood for and accomplished, but it fully shared and powerfully influenced the larger life of that age of progress as it had done in the fourth, the thirteenth and the sixteenth centuries; so that these four epochs may be taken as marking the great culminations in the history of the Christian pulpit.

While individual preachers in other centuries may have had as large or even larger audiences it is safe to say that in no former period in history did so many persons or so large a proportion of the world's inhabitants hear the word of God through preaching. Nor had there ever been so much preaching, nor in so many different lands and tongues as in the nineteenth century. Also the average quality of pulpit work as compared with that of the three other crests of power was notably high. Judged by all the standards—Biblical interpretation, intellectual force, popular impressiveness, spiritual fervor, and actual fruits—the preaching of the nineteenth century can bear comparison with that of any other. Wide indeed of the mark are those who talk of any comparative decline of pulpit power in that age; the truth lies in exactly the opposite direction. Alive, vigorous, broadminded and fruitful, the Christian pulpit of the nineteenth century appealed to and influenced every phase of the bounding life of the time. It pleaded every good cause, it championed every forward movement for human welfare, it strove against every vice and spoke with power for every virtue, it protested against every form of evil

and proclaimed throughout the world the love of God as revealed in the gospel of his Son.

The Catholic pulpit in Italy and other distinctively Romanist countries had able representatives, but in France, as in the seventeenth century, Catholic preaching came to its best in such men as Lacordaire, Ravignan, Felix, Hyacinthe (in his earlier days), Dupanloup and Didon. French Protestantism also showed that it had not lost the power to call forth great preachers when it summoned to the front in Switzerland, France and the Netherlands men like Malan and Merle d'Aubigne, the Monods (especially the saintly and eloquent Adolphe), Pressense and Bersier, and the Coquerels.

In Germany too there was great improvement over former conditions, and notwithstanding the remnants of rationalism and the power of scientific and critical hostility to evangelical Christianity, there were not a few preachers of spiritual fervor and wide influence. Schleiermacher led the way in opposing the cold and dreary rationalism of the preceding age with his notable appeal to religious feeling as well as thought. After him the best elements of German Christian thought found strong expression in such men as Draeseke, Menken, Krummacher, Tholuck, Gerok, Koegel and others.

In England and Scotland all phases of religious opinion found intelligent and strong advocates in the pulpit, and scarcely even in the classic seventeenth century are so many great preachers to be found as in the busy nineteenth. There are too many to name, but, to mention only a few, that was surely no ordinary epoch in the history of preaching which could produce such men as Robert Hall, Chalmers, Frederick Robertson, Melvill, Newman, McLeod, Binney, Punshon, Spurgeon, Liddon, Parker, and Maclaren.

Youngest of the mighty powers of the earth the United States came to national greatness in the nineteenth cen-

tury. It is a world's wonder. In that marvelous development preaching has had no inconsiderable share. It championed the cause of popular and religious education, it pleaded for missions and righteousness at home and abroad, it made the voice of love and purity and peace to be heard amid the clamor of greed and vice and strife of every sort, it taught in every hamlet of this broad land the lessons and the hopes of the Christian faith, and planted and nurtured Christian churches in places where Satan's seat was. The preacher and his message have made themselves felt in the social, literary, commercial and even political life as well as that of religion in every community of our grand cluster of States. There is no occasion or disposition to deny all the drawbacks, faults, weaknesses and errors of the American pulpit of the nineteenth century, but take it for all it was and for all it did, the world has scarcely known a more active, intelligent, and widely influential ministry of preaching. Its great variety, flexibility, adaptation, freedom, intensity and abiding influence upon thought, life and manners may be well known to any one at all acquainted with the institutions of our American civilization.

All sects and sections were nobly represented in the American ministry of the past hundred years. Great revivalists like Nettleton, Finney and Moody stirred large bodies of people and turned many to righteousness. Great pastors and orators like Channing, Bushnell, Beecher, Fuller, Simpson, Hoge and Brooks have drawn and moulded men in and far beyond the immediate range of their labors. Great teachers like Dwight, Wayland, the Alexanders, Thornwell, and our own incomparable Broadus, have not only guided young preachers in the schools, but have themselves been mighty preachers to the people. Nor must we forget the obscurer men whose work was little known beyond their own communities,

but the sum of whose contribution to our country's good no tongue can tell. Nor must we further omit to pay here a well deserved but inadequate tribute to those unlearned and even rude preachers of our land who published no sermons, wrought no great revolutions, but through toils and hardships, amid rough scenes and undeveloped societies worked for years, and laid foundations upon which others have builded. These men, often harshly even if justly criticised, not infrequently narrow and coarse, but full of zeal and untiring in labors, wrought out for communities which have become great States and mighty cities effects which endure among the best achievements of our time. The pioneer preacher, often derided and now almost forgotten, was not seldom the real founder of the prosperity which afterwards came to those who followed in his steps to reap with joy what he had sown in tears.

Far beyond all the countries which have passed before us in this too hasty survey we must take account of preaching in distant colonies and in heathen lands. Besides India, Canada, Australia, Cape Colony, and other parts of the great British Empire, there has been preaching in other colonies and other lands. The preacher has gone with the merchant, the farmer, the miner, and the soldier as part of the civilizing force in all the earth where colonies of the more cultured races have been established. Moreover, the great voluntary missionary work of all the Christian denominations throughout the heathen countries must be remembered when we speak of the preaching of the nineteenth century—emphatically since the first *the* missionary century of Christian history.

And what shall we think as we turn our eyes to the future? Will preaching continue to be a strong factor in civilization? A past so mighty and a present so alive cannot but be guarantee—under God's gracious provi-

dence—of a future no less fruitful. Preaching will abide as an established institution of Christianity along with that great force itself. It will continue to be wrapped up with all that is characteristic of the gospel of Jesus Christ. It will to the end of time be the chief though not the only means of proclaiming and teaching the truths and promises of the religion of our Lord. It will tell to future generations, as it has told to those that are past and is telling to our own, “the old, old story of Jesus and his love.” It will teach righteousness and rebuke sin in years to come as in years gone by. It will interpret the best aspirations of the human soul, and speak the most consoling words to human grief. It will cheer in the life that now is, and point, with a certitude and hopefulness that no other power on earth can have, to “the inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away.” It will proclaim the holiness and love of God to every coming generation of mankind, and speak with the tongue of the learned the “word in season to him that is weary.” It will always have to say amid the confusions and disappointments of earth, “And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three, and the greatest of these is love.”

AN OUTLINE STUDY OF THE FIRST CHAPTER OF EPHESIANS.

BY PROF. W. O. CARVER, D.D.

PAUL nowhere thinks more deeply and comprehensively than in Ephesians. His subject is the Christian Calling (cf 4:1); its nature (chs. 1-3), and its obligations (chs. 4-6). Chapter I., after a brief salutation (v. 1-2), gives a comprehensive view of the movement of God in this call. In this statement he not only presents some of his most characteristic conceptions but introduces some of his most pregnant, suggestive, and difficult phrases. The initial ideas are praise and prayer (vv. 3, 15). Paul is never more truly devout and consciously in the Spirit than when presenting the deepest thoughts of God and his work. He never sinks to the low plane of unreasoning sentiment, nor to the yet lower plane of mere intellectuality. His logic, keen, accurate, incisive, is always the logic of life, love, petition.

In our chapter we have; I. Praise to God for spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus (v. 4); which Paul proceeds to interpret (vv. 5-14); then, II. Praise for the saints (v. 15), for whom he prays, giving an outline of his prayers (vv. 16-19), and passing naturally, without a break in the sentence, into an informing tribute to Christ (vv. 20-23), wherein he sets forth the relation of Christ to the church. After the salutation, there are but these two sentences in the chapter and our two-fold division is inevitable. Paul has two main thoughts in which he has bound up this marvelous range of ideas. One of the most remarkable things about this remarkable Apostle is the relation of all Christian ideas in his thinking. For him "the unity of the faith and of the full knowledge of the Son of God"

(4:13) is a very real conception. Let us come to a more detailed outline.

I. Praise for Spiritual Blessings. (vv. 3-14.)

1. Introductory ascription of praise: Blessed the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who blessed us in every spiritual blessing in the heavenly relationships in Christ (v. 3).

(1). The English preserves, in "blessed," "blessed," "blessing," a pretty play of words in the Greek (Εὐλογη-
τος, ἐυλογήσας, ἐυλογ(α)).

(2). The praise is ascribed to the *God and Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, who blessed us *in Christ*, with every blessing *spiritual*. If this last term includes, as with Paul it well may, a reference to the Holy Spirit, then we have in this verse an initial reference to the Trinity. This exactly fits the situation, as the relation of the three persons in the Trinity to the redemptive call is the ground idea in the first sentence, as we shall presently see. Moreover, this Trinitarian reference is prominent in this epistle. (Cf. 2:18, 3:14-17, 4:3-7, etc.)

(3). The universal statement that God blessed us in *every blessing* is immediately subjected to a threefold limitation: (a) Such blessings as belong to the *spiritual*, mediated to the human spirit by the Holy Spirit; (b) Such as belong to our *heavenly relationships*. The ordinary rendering which supplies *places* with τοῖς οὐρανίοις is usually meaningless, so everywhere in this Epistle. Redemption has to do with our heavenly relationships; (c) Such as come to us *in Christ*. This term or its equivalent occurs continuously in this Epistle as elsewhere in Paul. He never allows us to forget for a moment that God moves toward men only in Christ and that in him alone does man move toward God. Every Christian activity has its location in him.

2. The Christian call in the foreordination of the Father. (vv. 4-6.) This includes:

(1) Eternal choice of us for perfection (v. 4), just as he chose us in him prior to the founding (casting down *καταβολῆς*, as from his hand) of the world for us to be holy (positive) and blameless (negative) in his presence. Our God relation is anterior to all earthly conditions.

(2) Divine sonship through Christ (vv. 5-6). Reading *ἐν ἀγάπῃ* with v. 5 rather than with v. 4, we have "in love having marked us off for putting into sonship unto himself through Jesus Christ. *υιοθεσίαν* is not adequately rendered by our "adoption." The basal reason for this divine act was the *good pleasure of his will*, a thought again enforced in vv. 9, 11. It is all to issue in the praise of the glory of that divine grace wherein God was gracious to us (*ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς*) in his (τῷ) Beloved. This thought is also made to run through the whole passage (vv. 12, 14). God planned redemption before the making of man's world and acted in his Beloved. So the glory is all his own.

3. Redemptive mercies realized in the Beloved Son, (vv. 7-13a). The items of this section include:

(1) In him we have (present) the ransom through his blood, viz., the putting away of our trespasses (not the consequences, but the *fallings*); and that in accordance with the divine grace which overran into us in all wisdom and understanding. (vv. 7-8.) The redemption is full in quantity and quality.

(2) The making known to us of the secret (*μυστήριον*) of God's volition (*θέλημα*, not *θέλησις*) and this is in accordance with a specific pleasure of God which he planned in Christ (v. 9).

(3) This plan looked to the working out, by stages appropriate to the progress of events, of the restoration in the Messiah (note the article here) of all things, whatever is subject of redemption in relation to heaven and earth. That this is in Christ is made especially emphatic by the insertion of the tautological *ἐν αὐτῷ* (v. 10).

(4) According to this plan, first of all the Jews were made an inheritance, being marked off beforehand in accordance with a plan of him whose energy accomplishes all things in accordance with the counsel of his own will (v. 11). This making of the Jews his inheritance was with a view of these Jews, with their antecedent hope in the Messiah, accomplishing the praise of God's glory (12). When the Gentiles heard the full truth, the good news of their share in the Messianic salvation, they believed and were marked as God's own (13a). Hence this redemption, eternally planned of God, and now made actual in Jesus is universal.

4) The completion of this work of making sinners redeemed sons is the sealing by the Spirit of promise (promised by God and more specifically by Christ), the Holy Spirit whose presence and work in the redeemed is God's assurance of his inheritance until the complete redemption of his purchase which is as yet only progressively his own. The teaching is, not that the Holy Spirit is to the redeemed "an earnest" (*ἄρραβὸν*) than he will be inherited, but to God a guarantee that he will fully possess in complete redemption (*ἀπολύτρωσιν*) the saved. Once more we must bear in mind that all is for the praise of his glory (vv. 13b-14).

II. The second sentence sets forth Paul's Prayer for the Redeemed.

1. All that God has done for these saints—chiefly Gentile saints—(*Διὰ τοῦτο*), from the day he heard of it, has been to the Apostle reason for continual praise and prayer (*οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν*) in their behalf. He is sure in such a case that he is praying in accordance with God's will, and he is encouraged by their faith life which has made reputation throughout the Christian world (vv. 15-16).

2. Next Paul indicates the items of his petition (vv. 17-20). It will help the accomplishment of his petitions

to let the saints know their subject. The burden of the petition is knowledge:

(1) That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, may give to you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the full knowledge (ἐπιγνώσει) of himself (the antecedent of αὐτοῦ is θεός). This redemption is of God and wrought out in Jesus Christ; hence it is appropriate to use the rare phrase *God of our Lord Jesus Christ* here. And, too, this redemptive work we have been four times reminded is *for the praise of his glory*; hence the *Father of glory* is to make it effective. This is to be by means of wise insight (σοφίας) into the plan and further revelation (ἀποκαλύψεως) of it. The spirit of wisdom here is ultimately (not primarily, perhaps) the Holy Spirit who would call to mind the words of Jesus and guide into fuller truth, functions corresponding to those named in this passage (v. 17).

(2) The “*eyes of the heart*” are to be opened so that the saints may know three things: (a) What is the hope of God’s calling; (b) What is the wealth of God’s inheritance in the saints; (c) What is the transcendent magnitude of God’s power in believers which is measured by the energy of the might of his own strength. How great this is we may see by its exercise in the Messiah when God raised him from among dead bodies and exalted him to his own right hand in the heavenly relations.

The Apostle pleads for a heart sympathy in the saints that will enable them to see their redemption from God’s side: see what he hoped for in calling them; what he inherits in getting them through Christ; what infinite power he has put into (εἰς) them for the realization of his hope and the exhibition of his glory in this inheritance. It will be observed that the use of the terms ἐκληρώθημεν (v. 11), and κληρονομίας (vv. 14, 18) refer to God’s getting the saints for himself, not to what the saints inherit from God. It is the Mosaic idea of God’s ownership in his

people, made more specific. Paul exhausts the wealth of the Greek vocabulary to set forth the limitless power for accomplishing God's purpose in the redeemed, using six terms (v. 9), and illustrating by the resurrection and exaltation of the Messiah (vv. 20-22).

3. The exaltation of the Messiah, introduced to illustrate the power by which God is effecting his purpose in the saints, is now more fully set forth and its practical bearing on the redemptive work is suggested. This was no mere exhibition of power, nor yet was it solely a reward to Jesus for his part in redeeming men, it was an essential part of the consummation of redemption (vv. 21-23). These verses are not to be separated from 17-20 as forming an entirely new division, for they constitute a definite part of the exhibition of God's power manifest in his dealing with Christ. But the new matter they introduce and the bearing of it call for their consideration as a separate stage in the argument.

For all this paragraph Gnosticism stands in the background. This is suggested by the exhaustiveness of the statement of Christ's superiority to all other of heavenly authorities in v. 21, and even more by the use of the term *πλήρωμα* in v. 23. Comparison of this passage with similar passages in Colossians (cf. 1:16-20) confirms the suggestion. Yet one needs to beware of allowing too much to the Gnostic idea in interpreting. The language is so selected as readily to meet that heresy in any mind holding it without suggesting it to one unacquainted with it. For both classes there is a teaching superior to and independent of all refutation of Gnosticism.

(1) In seating the Messiah on his right hand in "the heavenlies" (20) God placed him clear above (*ὑπεράνω*) every form of rule (*ἀρχῆς*), and authority (*ἐξουσίας*), and power (*δυνάμεως*), and lordship (*κυριότητος*), and made his name superior to every other not only for this age,

viz., of redemption through the Gospel up to the Second Coming, but also for the coming age (v. 21). The place of our Lord is permanent, eternal. Not only is he thus exalted as superior to every form and order of authority but he is universal Lord, for all things (emphatic position) God arranged in order under his feet (v. 22a). In redemption at least Christ is absolute Lord—all in all.

(2) But the chief bearing in all this is on the redeemed saints now. So Paul continues; and him he gave for Head beyond all to the Church which is his body, the fullness of him who in all respects (*πᾶσιν*) fills all the (*τὰ*) things that pertain to the redemptive plan and its realization (vv. 22b-23). He is beyond everything, human or super-human, to the church. There is "one mediator between God and man" exhausting in himself all the needs and functions of redemptive mediation. The Church must seek for and must own no other mediator. He is given to her for Head. The *ἐκκλησία* here, as always in this epistle, comprehends all the redeemed on earth. One cannot say positively whether it embraces also redeemed who have died but apparently not, certainly not distinctly.

But we now come to a new turn in the thought. If Christ has been given to the Church for Head, then it is (*ἥτις*) his body. This is no mere inference but just the climax all along sought. God gave him to the Church (dative, not accusative, interest, not mere outcome). He is Head, it is body. Surely no other mediation can separate them. Each is complement to the other. This brings the Church into vital relationship to the redemptive work. It almost introduces a fourth factor in the work, to be added to the three persons of the Trinity. It does not do this for the reason that the Church is made the Messiah's body. But peculiar honor and responsibility rests upon the Church as Christ's body for it is *the fullness* of him who fills all things in all respects. He alone is God's expression in actualizing the redemptive ideals (the Holy

Spirit which Christ sends not being brought into contrast with him), and the Church is the full expression of the Redeemer. The thought is too high, we cannot attain unto it. All the Messiah's success is found and conserved in the Church. And all his work is now effected through the Church since it is his body, his fullness. He is thinking, willing Head; it is active, effective body in whose members the thought of the Head is accomplished.

Of course apart from its Head this body is nothing but a corpse. From the Head it gets its thought, its life, its action, its energy, all. When it accepts any other head it dies for there can be no artificial head. And this is the more important that the Head, the Messiah perfects his Messianic work only in the perfect development of the body, the Church, and in its complete response to his every impulse. The body must be the perfect instrument of the Head before we see "the fullness of him who in all respects is fulfilling all."

We conclude with this from Moule: " 'What shall we say then to these things?' Perhaps the first and best response is the Amen of holy silence. * * * These sentences were written first and supremely to be believed, received, and—in worshipping and serving life—lived out. Let us *hear* them, in a hush of soul, without haste, and without talk."

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ON THE HIGHEST GOOD.

BY PROF. JAMES STALKER, D.D.,
Aberdeen, Scotland.

WHEN Aristotle and the ancient thinkers spoke of the Highest Good, their meaning was that in this earthly life of ours there is for everyone a single supreme attainment, which, if missed, will render life a failure, but, if gained, will render it a success.

No one in the least acquainted with the teaching of Jesus can fail to recognize that the same assumption was constantly made by him and was even expressed in a great variety of forms. This, for example, is what is intended in such parables as the Pearl of Great Price and the Hidden Treasure. These imply that this world affords to everyone a supreme opportunity of making life worth living. But the most obvious expression of this intention is the constant use by Jesus of the word Gospel as a comprehensive name for his message. This word *εὐαγγέλιον* refers, in its original sense, I suppose, to the good news brought by a swift runner to those waiting for information. It summons up in the imagination the picture of a city in a state of anxiety and uncertainty; the watchmen on the walls are looking eagerly in a certain direction; at last the messenger is descried in the distance, his manner of running betokening that he is the bearer of glad tidings. At the gate of the city he is met by the multitude, who crowd around him. He unfolds his news, which passes quickly from mouth to mouth and from group to group, till the whole city is rocking with excitement and jubilation. St. Matthew enters, exactly into the spirit of such a scene

when he describes the commencement of the preaching of Jesus in these words: "The people which sat in darkness saw a great light, and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up;" and the descriptions in all the gospels of the opening ministry of our Lord, when the inhabitants of the city and village came streaming in thousands from one end of the country to the other, entirely corresponds to such a situation. In the later stages of the earthly course of Jesus this sunny aspect of his message may not have been so conspicuous; but it reasserts itself in the early preaching of the apostles after the resurrection. Wherever St. Paul, for example, went as a missionary, he must have conveyed the impression that he was bringing tidings which it concerned everyone to hear for his own welfare and happiness, and, in spite of the persecution he had to endure, he himself was borne up with the sense that he was the bearer of a secret of infinite value. This is the fundamental note of Christianity at all times; the salt has lost its savor if the preaching of the Christian pulpit does not spell Glad Tidings.

When, however, we take the next step and enquire about the contents of the good news of which Jesus was the herald, the reply is not exactly what might be anticipated. If the ordinary man were asked what the gospel of Jesus was about, he would reply without hesitation that it was the gospel "of salvation," or "of the grace of God," or perhaps "of justification by faith." But if requested to verify his suggestion by reference to the actual words of Christ, he would be nonplussed; because he would find no such phraseology in the record. What he would find in place of it would be "the gospel of the Kingdom," or "of the kingdom of God," or "of the kingdom of heaven," all these forms of the same phrase occurring in the gospels. Even those who are thoroughly familiar with the words of Christ have no idea how frequently these phras-

es are found there or how completely they occupy the place of the phrases just suggested. In the beginning of St. Mark the opening of the ministry is thus described: "Now, after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God." St. Matthew describes what Jesus was doing a little later in these words: "He went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom;" and St. Luke states in like manner, "It came to pass afterwards that He went through every city and village, preaching and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God." When the Twelve are sent forth to do in a humbler way the same thing as was done by himself, it is reported as follows: "He sent them to preach the kingdom of God." And everyone can recall how frequently his parables begin with the formula "The kingdom of heaven is like," while the parables as a whole are designated by their author as "The mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." It would be easy to extend such quotations, were it necessary; but it may be taken for granted that Christ's own name for the supreme good of human life was the kingdom of God.

This result is a surprising one for three reasons—first, because this phrase, in which he wrapped up the kernel of his preaching, was not of his own invention. It was employed before him by John the Baptist, one of the notes of whose message was, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Even he, however, was not the originator. Those who dig in the literary remains of the period between the Old Testament and the New find it there; so that it was part of the religious language of the day, which Jesus, as a child of his time and country, inherited. This encourages us to enquire if it can be traced further back—to the Old Testament—and, when we search we have not far to look; because in the book of Daniel we read that the great world-kingdoms, which Daniel saw in vision, were

to be superseded by what he expressly called "the kingdom of God;" and in his famous prophecy of the Son of man, it is written, "There shall be given unto him dominion, glory and a kingdom; and all peoples, nations and languages shall serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Indeed, when thus we embark on the Old Testament Scriptures, a vast field of inquiry opens out before us. We soon realize that the entire history of the people of God in that dispensation was founded on the conception of a kingdom of God. This was the ideal which had been given to the Hebrews by Moses, and their whole actual history had been a compromise between this vision and reality. When they first demanded a king, that they might be like the other nations, they were told that God was their king and that they ought to desire no other. In the centuries that followed the history of the monarchy in Israel was far from affording clear proof that the compromise had been effectual. And deep down in the heart of the more spiritual elements of the nation, the primeval idea lingered, receiving glowing expression in the writings of the prophets. At length the earthly monarchies perished, and the nation was led away into exile, but in the gloom of captivity the ancient hope shown out again. Although the earthly monarchy was lost, all was not lost. If God would take to himself his great power and reign, the glory of the future might far excel the past. The return from Babylon was a marvellous providential intervention, which proved that Jehovah had still in reserve for his people a future and a hope. The restored state, however, proved to be only a day of small things. This was not the kingdom of God of which the prophets had spoken and for which the pious had sighed. And, as the generations went on, things grew worse instead of better. The noble effort of the Maccabees was exhausted; Herod, an alien, was

on the throne, and the Romans, with their irresistible force, were in the background. In all patriotic hearts smouldered the fires of discontent and indignation. Yet hope was not extinct. At length John the Baptist proclaimed, not only that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, but that after himself was coming one the latchet of whose shoes he was not worthy to unloose; and the question sent by John from the prison to Jesus, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" undoubtedly embodied the state of mind of far more than himself.

A second reason for surprise at the prominence of the kingdom of God in the teaching of Christ is the fact that it was not destined to maintain this position in the teaching of Christianity. While the phrase is very frequent in the Gospels, in the reports of Christ's own words, it is infrequent in the other books of the New Testament, and in some of these it does not appear at all. This has been quoted as evidence that the doctrine of Christianity is very different from that of Christ; but it may simply mean that new and perhaps more appropriate language had unconsciously been found for ideas essentially the same. The Apostolic age was too much alive to be the slave of phraseology, even if this were the phraseology of its master. When the apostles went forth into the heathen world, it is easy to understand that they could not speak much of a kingdom, because such language would have been misunderstood and interpreted as treason against the Roman Empire. The kingdom was an essentially Jewish idea; and, when the Jewish state had ceased to exist, the phrase was dropped as a matter of course. Since then attempts have from time to time been made to revive it. The Pietists, for example, of Germany, in the eighteenth century, loved to speak of work for the kingdom of God, instead of for the Church or for Christianity; and, strange to say, the bitterest opponents of Pietism, Ritschl and his followers, in the nineteenth cen-

ture, have endeavored to re-introduce it as the highest category of theology. I have not observed whether in America this has commanded much assent; but there are not wanting in Great Britain scholars who have signified their agreement with it. I question, however, whether the kingdom of God is likely again to come into general use as the name for Christianity. To the common ear it has a forced and foreign sound. Kings and kingdoms do not appeal to the modern as they did to the ancient mind, some of the most advanced modern nations being republican. Still, as having been the favorite term used by our Lord for his own cause, it will always have a certain attraction for the Christian mind; and its use in two familiar words of our Lord will always prevent it from becoming antiquated—the petition in the Lord's prayer which makes us say "Thy kingdom come," and the sacred word about the little children, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven."

But the reason which most of all makes it surprising that Jesus employed this term for the highest good is that it brought Him into conflict with the ideas and expectations of his contemporaries and fellow-countrymen. It might seem to be in accommodation with these that he made use of the phrase; but it turned out that under this name they and he were thinking of entirely different things. The difference between them may perhaps be best expressed by saying that they and he laid the emphasis on different members of the phrase, they placing it on "the kingdom," he on "of God." It was of the kingdom they were thinking, that is of emancipation from the Romans, of a place and a court of their own, of influence and predominance, among the nations. He, on the contrary, was thinking of a kingdom *of God*—that is, of God being more fully revealed, of the will of God being done on earth as it is done in heaven. None can read the Gospels attentively without sometimes pitying the Jews

because he was so different from the Messiah they were expecting; and the doubt may even insinuate itself into a sympathetic mind whether he was justified in employing language about a kingdom of God which they, being what they were, could hardly help misunderstanding. The tragic difference of view was not reconciled. The nation was groaning under the chastisement of the Almighty, yet it did not repent; instead of responding to the spiritual appeals of Jesus, it remained earthly and ambitious. He was only a reproach to it. To practical and worldly minds he appeared visionary; and a great resentment—and hatred invaded their hearts at the thought that such an one could presume to call himself their Messiah; this seemed to them to be casting ridicule on a great idea. This dreamer would never be able to bring to them the prizes for which they sighed, and it angered them that he should pretend to do so. Thus it was that the catastrophe was brought about, when the nation nailed him to a tree.

The stronger, however, the reasons against the use of “the kingdom of God,” as the usual name for the highest that Christ had brought to the world, the more certain is it that he must have had the best of reasons for making use of it.

First, it connected his teaching with the tradition of the Old Testament and the past history of the people of God. Original and unique as Jesus is, he is never disconnected from the nation to which he belonged. His mind is saturated with the ideas of the Old Testament; his language is learned from its phraseology; the figures of the patriarchs and the pious kings occupy his imagination; and he knows himself to be the successor and the heir of the prophets. If the kingdom of God was the underlying idea of the whole Old Testament history, this was the best reason for its being the most prominent watchword of his preaching.

Secondly, he was influenced in adopting this phrase by

the home in which he was brought up. In the Jewish society of his time there was one section in which the tradition of the past was cherished in peculiar purity; its members are sometimes designated by the name of the *Προσδεχόμενοι*, which simply means that they were waiting for the kingdom of God. To this section belonged the home in which Jesus was born and brought up, as did that of John the Baptist; and in the songs which emanated from this circle in the era of the Advent, and which have been preserved in the commencement of the Gospels, we possess the most vivid image of the hopes with which their minds were filled. These all center in the kingdom of God. These pious souls were pining and praying day and night over the degradation of their country and watching for the dawn of a better day, to which they applied this name. In making use of this term Jesus is sometimes spoken of as accommodating himself to the ideas of his time; but, in truth, he was employing language as native to himself as were the syllables he prattled at his mother's knee

But, thirdly, the reason for the use of this name must be sought still deeper in his own consciousness. He knew himself to be the Messiah of his people, under whose kingship the highest good of man was to be enjoyed. It is true he kept back his acknowledgement for a time, at least in certain circles, mainly because of the contrast already spoken of between that which he intended by the name Messiah and that which his contemporaries understood. But, when his disciples at Cæsarea Philippi acknowledged him to be the Christ, he made it perfectly manifest that he accepted the title; and, before the end came he testified to the entire nation by his triumphal entry into Jerusalem what the claim was which he made. It is difficult to avoid sometimes asking what would have happened if this claim had been conceded and the Jewish nation had heartily accepted him as its Messiah. Would

he have ascended the throne of the country and thence ruled the world? To such a question there is of course no answer. But surely we may say that the world missed an incomparable splendor when, instead of hailing Jesus of Nazareth as king of the Jews, the inhabitants of Jerusalem cried out "Crucify him." That, however, which from one point of view was the hostile will of his blind fellow-countrymen was from another the will of Heaven; and Jesus accepted it as such. We cannot think of it but as a cruel disappointment to him when the current of events bore him away from the goal to which he was striving; but, just because it was at the same time the current of Providence, he not only obeyed it but found in it a divine guidance to a prize still more desirable than the one he had missed. And so Jesus remains forever the supreme illustration of that faith in Providence which he recommended to others. He was led, like one blind, by a way that he knew not; and he won all by losing all. As early as the temptation in the wilderness he had had to face the alternative of a vast external kingdom without interior reality and a small kingdom with genuine power; and he had—not indeed without a struggle, but decisively and irrevocably—chosen the latter. The Jewish people adhered to their own conception of the kingdom of God, working it out till it issued in his crucifixion; but no less resolutely did Jesus adhere to his own conception of the same, working it out in the choice and training of his followers. Of these there were only twelve; and at his death the circle had only extended to five hundred; but these were the nucleus of a kingdom destined to become worldwide; and in them his own conception of what the kingdom of God should be was actually fulfilled.

It is now, however, high time to be asking what are the permanent elements in the teaching of Jesus about the kingdom of God and what message for ourselves it still contains; for, even if we do not adopt the language of

Jesus, certainly the ideas and the spirit which he poured into this phrase are still of importance for us.

First, there are those who would say the chief lesson to be derived by us from this phrase is what it teaches about the social nature of Christianity—a kingdom being not of one but of many, linked together in gradations of honor and mutual helpfulness. Jesus, they say, delivered mankind from an individual and selfish view of religion and introduced a religion of brotherhood and common endeavor. The conception of religion, however, as a corporate impulse, so far from being a discovery of Jesus, was common to the whole ancient world. This is especially the view of the Old Testament, in which both the reproofs and the promises of the Prophets are addressed not to individuals, but to the nation at large, and only slowly and dimly, as the book is drawing to a close, does the truth emerge, that the individual is capable of a personal relation to God. It would be truer to affirm that Jesus stripped religion of its national character and made it individual. Yet to say so would only be to state half the truth. The individuality which he teaches is at the same time universality; because a society into which every individual can enter, without regard to age, station or race is really universal, the only qualification consisting in that which is common to all men. Herein, then, consists the originality of Jesus; He stripped religion of its national and racial character making it individual, in order that thereby it might become universal. The religion of Jesus Christ is, in the first place, a personal experience, a secret blessedness, a spiritual discovery, filling the soul with a joy which makes every sacrifice appear light on which its possession depends; and then in the second place, it is a glorious brotherhood and league of endeavor and victory.

Another idea which is kept fresh by this phrase is that of Loyalty. Kings and kingdoms may not now, as has

been already acknowledged, bulk as largely as they once did in the thoughts of men; but loyalty is an indispensable sentiment, the inspiration of all high endeavor. In the steamer in which I recently crossed the ocean to America, I was conversing with a fellow-passenger about a man of great eminence recently deceased in the Methodist church, of which my interlocutor is himself an ornament, and after discussing the qualities of the departed servant of God, he added, "But that which really accounted for his life was an enthusiastic love for the Son of God." This is what I mean by loyalty; and without loyalty to the king there will never be much done, for the kingdom of God.

A third idea kept fresh by this phrase is man's immortal destiny. When the kingdom of God is named in the hearing of the common man, what he thinks of is a place in some distant part of the universe, which will be the portion of true Christians after death. It need hardly be said that this was not what Jesus meant by the phrase; yet this is included in his conception, as may be supposed to be especially indicated when he employs the form, the "kingdom of heaven" instead of the "kingdom of God." It is in the Gospel of St. Matthew that the former occurs, this evangelist frequently making Jesus say the "Kingdom of heaven" where the others report him as saying the "kingdom of God." There has, indeed, been much learned discussion as to the reason of this substitution. Some suppose that "heaven" is simply a name for God; so we use it ourselves in such a phrase as "Heaven help him;" and Jesus himself employs the word in this sense when he makes the prodigal son say to his father, "I have sinned against heaven and before thee." Others suppose it to indicate the source from which the kingdom is derived or to which it is akin. But the best explanation is that it expresses Christ's own abiding consciousness of the existence of a portion of the

universe in which all that he desired for this world is at all times perfectly fulfilled. Heaven is not a future state, as it is often called, but a present state; the ideal is already actually realized; and the desire of Jesus was only to extend its reign. Of course, however, heaven is likewise a future inheritance, which will compensate for all the sacrifices entailed on the disciples of Jesus in this world and repair all the imperfections of which they were conscious. Even to the writers of the Old Testament, the belief in it was dim and occasional; but Jesus dwelt in his region as in his home and fatherland, and certainly this formed a large part of all his promises.

But by far the most important idea embodied in the "kingdom of God" is that indicated by Jesus himself, when, in the Lord's Prayer, he expounds the petition, "Thy kingdom come" by the one which follows, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." Wherever in a nation or a home or a heart, the will of God is done, there the kingdom of God exists; and this is something which never grows old. For the will of God Jesus had the most passionate love, into which entered all the feeling he had for his Father in heaven, as well as all the hope he cherished for the improvement of the world. When any human being did the will of God, Jesus said, "The same is my brother and sister and mother." At the crisis of his passion in Gethsemane, the discords of his soul were resolved in the prayer, "Not my will, but thine be done." Where God's will is done, there may, for the moment, be suffering and renunciation, as there were in his own case, but ultimately there must be success and happiness; for the stars in their courses fight on behalf of the man who is doing the will of God, and all the winds of heaven waft him to his goal.

This is the thought expressed in the Beatitudes, with which the Sermon on the Mount opens and in which the true key-note of all his testimony is sounded. Eight times

over is the word "Blessed" rung out, as if to make audible the whole gamut of its music. The structure of these remarkable utterances of the Lord is often misunderstood, it being supposed that the justification of the predicate, "blessed," lies in the subject of each sentence, in which the character of true discipleship is defined; it really lies in a small supplementary sentence introduced in each beatitude by the conjunction "for"—"for they shall be comforted;" "for they shall see God;" "for they shall be called the children of God;" and so on. Or rather each beatitude is an equation, on the one side of which stands "blessed," while on the opposite side there are two magnitudes, the one expressing the spiritual condition of those spoken of and the other a new condition into which they are about to pass, the one of these may be a negative quantity, as when it is said, "Blessed are they that mourn," but the other is so large a positive quantity that the two together exhibit a magnificent "plus" of happiness. It is very significant that both the first and the eighth of these explanatory clauses, in which the kernel of the Beatitudes lies, are identical, and that in both the kingdom of heaven is named as the essence of blessedness—"Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," "Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." This indicates again, with extraordinary clearness, what I have been saying all through this article, that the kingdom of heaven is Christ's own expression for the Highest Good. In the Beatitudes, after the first, it may be presumed, the teacher is exhibiting in detail the various kinds of blessedness, wrapped up in the kingdom of God; but, having reached the seventh, he has nothing more to add, but simply repeats the first, thus sounding forth as the octave the note which has already served as the keynote.

“What,” asks Aristotle, “is the highest of all realizable goods? As to its name, I suppose nearly all men are agreed; for the masses of men and the men of culture alike declare that it is happiness.” Against this dictum the stoics, in ancient times, declaimed, ridiculing the desire for happiness felt by every human heart; and in our own time Thomas Carlyle has taken up their parable, scoffing at the notion, taken for granted, as he would say, in every foolish brain, that anyone needs to be happy or has any natural right to happiness. Men are miserable, he argues, because they entertain exorbitant notions of their own deserts and are astonished when nature does not agree with them; but let them take it for granted that they deserve nothing, and then the slightest favors of fortune will be welcomed as surprises. But the desire for happiness is far too deeply seated in the human soul to be argued away by any eloquence. Jesus, ever true to nature, acknowledged it as one of the primordial forces of our being, and endeavored to enlist it among the motives of goodness. Only he put the word “blessedness” in the place of the word happiness—a simple yet a radical change; because blessedness is a happiness pure and spiritual, reaching down to the profoundest elements of human nature and reaching forth to the illimitable developments of eternity.

THE CODE OF HAMMURABI AND THE LAWS OF MOSES. II.¹

BY JOHN R. SAMPEY, D.D., LL.D.

IV. COMPARISON OF HAMMURABI'S CODE WITH THE PENTATEUCH.

In instituting a comparison of the Code of Hammurabi with the Laws of Moses, we are embarrassed by the wealth of material in the two codes that might properly be brought under review. It will be necessary, in this brief article, to omit much that one would like to include. We shall consider

1. PRINCIPLES AND PRECEPTS IN WHICH HAMMURABI AND MOSES AGREE.

(a) Here we put at the front that which probably first attracts the attention of the general reader as he takes a rapid survey of Hammurabi's Code, viz., the *lex talionis*: "If a man destroy the eye of another man, they shall destroy his eye. If one break a man's bone, they shall break his bone. If a man knock out a tooth of a man of his own rank, they shall knock out his tooth" (CH,² 196, 197 and 200). In the Pentateuch the law of retaliation is fully stated in Ex. 21:23-25; Lev. 24:19f; Deut. 19:21. That law required the sacrifice of "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."

(b) Intended harm must be punished as well as the overt act. Compare CH, 1-4 with Deut. 19:16-21. Hammurabi's Code opens with a recognition of this principle:

¹ Completed from the Baptist Review and Expositor, April, 1904.

² CH stands for Code of Hammurabi.

“If a man bring an accusation against a man, and charge him with a (capital) crime, but cannot prove it, he, the accuser, shall be put to death.” Moses lays down as the punishment for the man who testifies falsely against his brother: “Then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to do unto his brother.”

(c) The principle of full restitution for damage has the approval of both lawgivers. Moses deals with this subject at length in Ex. 21:33—22:15. The principle receives frequent recognition in the Code of Hammurabi, and he does not hesitate to use the multiplication table in assessing damages. While Moses requires fivefold restitution for stealing an ox, Hammurabi demands sixfold from the merchant who tries to cheat his agent, twelvefold from the judge who alters his verdict and thirtyfold for stealing an animal from temple or palace (CH, 107, 5 and 8). Where the blame is not great, the general principle obtains in both codes that justice is satisfied if a man restores to the owner “ox for ox, sheep for sheep” (Ex. 22:12, 14 and CH, 245, 53, 59, and often).

(d) Both Hammurabi and Moses admit the use of an oath of innocence to avoid making restitution. Hammurabi writes: “If a man hire an ox and a god strike it and it die, the man who hired the ox shall take an oath before god and go free” (CH, 249. Compare Ex. 22:10 f).

(e) Neither lawgiver would allow a creditor to hold in pledge what was necessary to health and life. For the Hebrew the outer garment served as a covering from the night chill (Ex. 22:26f), and the handmill was indispensable in preparing food (Deut. 24:6). For the agriculturist of the Babylonian plain the ox was his means of earning a living, and so Hammurabi writes: “If a man seize an ox for debt, he shall pay one-third mana of silver” (C H, 241).

(f) Both codes make large use of the death penalty.

(1) For kidnaping (Ex. 21:16; Deut. 24:7 and C H, 14).

The Mosaic law applies to man-stealing in every form, while Hammurabi limits the penalty to stealing a minor son.

(2) For burglary when caught in the act (C H, 21 and Ex. 22:2-4). Moses simply *permits* the destruction of the burglar in the act of breaking in by night; Hammurabi *requires* the destruction of every burglar and brigand when captured.

(3) For adultery, rape and the more flagrant forms of incest. Compare C H, 129 with Deut. 22:22; C H, 130 with Deut. 22:25; and C H, 155, 157 with Lev. 20:11-21. While Moses commands the death of both adulterer and adulteress, Hammurabi says, "if the husband of the woman would save his wife, or if the king would save his male servant (he may)."

2. LAWS WITH PENALTIES MORE SEVERE IN HAMMURABI'S CODE THAN IN THE PENTATEUCH.

(a) The death penalty is affixed by Hammurabi to theft and related crimes (C H, 6-11, 21 f, 25). Hammurabi reverses the Biblical order by visiting sins against property with heavier penalties than sin against the person. To the ancient Babylonian the thief was worse than the murderer. "If a man steal the property of a god or palace, that man shall be put to death; and he who receives from his hand the stolen property shall also be put to death" (C H, 6). While death was the usual penalty for theft, in some cases restitution was accepted. "If a man steal ox or sheep, ass or pig, or boat—if it be from a god or a palace, he shall restore thirtyfold; if it be from a free-man, he shall render tenfold. If the thief have nothing wherewith to pay he shall be put to death" (C H, 8). Even careless buying from minors or slaves, without witnesses or contracts, made one liable to death as a thief (C H, 7). Failure to establish an asserted claim of own-

ership might lead to death on account of attempted fraud (C H, 11).

Moses permits a man to kill a burglar caught in the act of breaking in at night. For stealing, the heaviest penalty is to be sold into slavery, if restitution cannot otherwise be made (Ex. 22:1-4).

(b) Hammurabi also exacts heavier financial compensation. The heaviest fine affixed in the Pentateuch is to pay fivefold for the theft of an ox. The Code of Hammurabi requires from tenfold to thirtyfold compensation, with death as the penalty for failure to pay. In case of dishonesty in a matter of deposit Moses required restitution of the principal plus one-fifth (Lev. 6:2-5), while Hammurabi exacted fivefold restitution for dishonesty in appropriating goods committed to one for transportation (C H, 112).

(c) The ordeal through which Hammurabi forced a wife suspected of unfaithfulness to pass, was much more severe than the trial by water as laid down in Numbers 5:12-28. The Babylonian law is as follows: "If the finger have been pointed at the wife of a man because of another man, and she have not been taken in lying with another man, for her husband's sake she shall throw herself into the river" (C H, 132).

(d) Mutilation, which was almost unknown in Israel (Deut. 25:11f), was quite common among the Babylonians. Both Moses and Hammurabi, as we have seen, enjoin it as the penalty for mutilating another, "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." Hammurabi specifies the following forms of punitive mutilation: (1) Branding of the forehead for slandering a woman (C H, 127). (2) Cutting off the ear of a slave for striking the son of a gentleman (205), or for denying his master (282). (3) Cutting off the fingers of a son for striking his father (195), of a bungling surgeon for causing the death of his patient (218), of a brander who brands a slave without the

owner's consent (226) and of a tenant who steals the seed or crop (253). (4) Cutting off the breast of a wet nurse for substituting, without permission, a second child (194). (5) Tearing out the eye of a scornful adopted son (193). (6) Cutting out the tongue of an adopted son who denies his foster parents (192).

(e) Moses names forty stripes as the maximum penalty for any offense punishable with the rod (Deut. 25: 1-3), but Hammurabi says: "If a man strike the person of a man who is his superior, he shall receive sixty strokes with an ox-tail whip in public" (202).

3. LAWS WITH PENALTIES MORE SEVERE IN THE PENTATEUCH THAN IN THE CODE OF HAMMURABI.

(a) Moses assigns the death penalty to some offenses visited with lighter punishment by the Babylonians. (1) For smiting parents (Ex. 21:15) Hammurabi prescribes mutilation (195). Reverence for parents is a cardinal feature in Hebrew ethics. A drunken, disobedient, worthless son might be brought to trial by his parents and suffer death for his crimes (Deut. 21:18-21). The law is an evidence of rigorous parental authority among the Hebrews. We may well doubt the occurrence of one death to the century under this law. Hammurabi safeguarded the son against the caprice of the father, in two statutes which give evidence of a high civilization: "If a man set his face to disinherit his son and say to the judges: 'I will disinherit my son,' the judges shall inquire into his antecedents, and if the son have not committed a crime sufficiently grave to cut him off from sonship, the father may not cut off his son from sonship. If he have committed a crime against his father sufficiently grave to cut him off from sonship, they shall condone his first (offense). If he commit a grave crime a second time, the father may cut off his son from sonship" (C H, 168, 169).

(2) Moses affixes death as the punishment for the care-

less owner of a goring ox, who refuses to protect the public against his murderous assaults (Ex. 21:28-30). Hammurabi exacts a fine of one-half mana of silver, if the bull destroys the son of a gentleman (C H, 250-252).

The heavy penalties on careless physicians and house builders ought to be read in this connection (C H, 218, 229-233).

(3) Moses named death as the penalty for witchcraft, sorcery and kindred arts (Ex. 22:18; Lev. 19:26, 31; 20:6, 27; Deut. 18: 10-14). Soothsayers had recognized standing in the religious life of Hammurabi's time, as we learn from one of his letters to Siniddinam. Sorcery to the injury of another man was accounted a crime, as we learn from C H, 2.

(4) Moses carries the death penalty for incest even further than Hammurabi (Compare Lev. 20:11 with C H, 158).

(b) The term of service of a bondservant is twice as long in the Pentateuch as in the Code of Hammurabi (C H, 117 and Ex. 21:2-6; Lev. 25:39-43; Deut. 15:12-14). But observe the superior philanthropy of the Hebrew lawgiver in Deut. 15:13f. The servant is to receive liberal gifts out of the flock and the granary and the winepress.

(c) According to the Pentateuch divorce is more completely in the husband's hands (Compare Deut. 24:1f with the elaborate provisions and safeguards of C H, 137-142). But while a good wife might prefer to live under the Code of Hammurabi, a wicked woman might well dread the application of its statutes. When such a woman applies for divorce, "if she have not been a careful mistress, have gadded about, have neglected her house and have belittled her husband, they shall throw that woman into the water" (143).

4. OFFENSES CONDEMNED BY HAMMURABI, BUT NOT NAMED BY MOSES.

(a) Hiding a fugitive slave, or aiding a slave to escape, was punishable by death (C H, 15, 16). Moses, on the other hand, forbids the Hebrews to deliver up a fugitive slave to his master (Deut. 23:15f).

(b) Buying from minors or slaves without witnesses and contracts is expressly forbidden in the Code of Hammurabi (7).

(c) The ingratitude of an adopted son is punished with the loss of an eye or of the tongue (C H, 192, 193).

(d) A wet nurse who after the death of the child committed to her care takes another without the consent of the parents of the dead child, is punished by mutilation (C H, 194).

5. OFFENSES CONDEMNED BY MOSES, BUT NOT BY HAMMURABI.

a. Moses forbids all unnatural crimes and abuses, with severe penalties, and absolutely forbids lust under the forms of religion (Ex. 22:19; Lev. 18:21-23; 20:10-21; Deut. 23:17f). Hammurabi recognizes religious prostitution (C H, 110, 178-182, 193). Moses warns the Hebrews against the surrender of their daughters to a life of shame (Lev. 19:29). Incest in the Law of Moses is made more inclusive than in the Code of Hammurabi (Lev. 18:6-18, C H, 154-158).

b. Moses expressly forbids false weights and false measures (Lev. 19:35f; Deut. 25:13-16). No doubt Hammurabi punished men for the use of dishonest weights and measures. The silence of his code does not argue indifference on a subject so vital to the commercial development of his realm.

c. Moses does not allow a Hebrew to lend to a brother Hebrew on interest. Foreigners were required to pay

interest just as among other nations (Deut. 15:7-11; 23:19f). The Babylonians lent on interest in the same fashion as modern bankers, taking mortgages on real estate and personal property as security.

d. Unkindness to strangers, orphans, the blind, hired servants and slaves is repeatedly forbidden in the Pentateuch (Ex. 22:21-24; Lev. 19:33f; Deut. 24:14f, 17f). By Moses, slaves are regarded as human beings and also as property; by Hammurabi they are treated as merely the property of their owner (Compare Ex. 21:20f, 26f with C H, 199, 231, 219). Moses founded his ethical code on love towards one's neighbor, and it is worthy of note that the Hebrew was commanded to love the stranger as himself (Lev. 19:9-34). Many persons fail to link Lev. 19:34 with Lev. 19:18.

e. Moses forbids cruelty to animals (Ex. 23:19; Deut. 25:4). Hammurabi protects them merely as property having a money value (C H, 245-248).

f. Moses punished severely a son for cursing father or mother (Ex. 21:17; Lev. 20:9).

g. Moses and Hammurabi are in sharp contrast on the subject of punishing children for the sins of their parents. In naming the penalties for neglect in constructing a house, Hammurabi states that the builder shall be put to death if the house collapse and kill the owner of the house. Yet further he decrees: "If it cause the death of a son of the owner of the house, they shall put to death a son of that builder" (230). This law of retaliation applies also to daughters, so that a man who had killed the daughter of another man would suffer punishment not in his own person but in that of his daughter. "If that woman die, they shall put his daughter to death" (210).

The Law of Moses sounds a bugle blast against any such procedure. "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for

his own sin" (Deut. 24:16). This ringing prohibition in the Law of Moses may have been aimed at such laws and usages as are recounted in C H, 210 and 230.

Many merciful provisions of the Mosaic system are not found in Hammurabi's Code. The weekly Sabbath, the Sabbatic year and the year of jubilee brought rest and joy to the poor in Israel (Ex. 23:10-12; Lev. 25:1-55). The gleanings of harvest and vintage and the corners of the field belonged to the poor and needy (Deut. 24:19-22; Lev. 19:9f). Every third year the people were to lay up a tithe of their increase for joyous feasts to which the Levite, the stranger and the orphan were to be invited (Deut. 14:28f). Kindness to the unfortunate and helpless was to be the rule of Israel's life (Lev. 19:14; Deut. 27:18).

Any general estimate of the two systems of law which we have been comparing the one with the other will almost certainly be colored by our own attitude toward the Bible. If we try to make an impartial comparison, we may frankly admit the superiority of Hammurabi's Code in certain particulars. The civilization of Babylon 2250 B.C. was higher than that of the Hebrews during the Egyptian bondage and the wilderness wandering. Back of Hammurabi lay centuries and milleniums of human progress in the plains of Babylonia. The organization of law courts and the development of the processes of legal procedure were in advance of the forms common among the Hebrew tribes. Advanced critics have sometimes overlooked the evidence that Israel too had courts for the trial of civil suits from the very earliest period of the national life (Ex. 18; Deut. 1:9-18; 16:18-20; 17:8-13). But the Babylonians of Hammurabi's day had the modern conception of the state, while the Hebrew put a large emphasis on the tribe. Hence among the Babylonians the distinctions between foreigners and natives were almost ignored, while the Hebrews remained on the Bed-

ouin plane of blood revenge. The next of kin was the executioner among the Hebrews, but the Babylonians had courts with regular judges, constables, and other officers. This official class administered justice in the name of the state and in the interest of the realm.

In many details the rights of women and minors were better safeguarded by Hammurabi than by Moses. The rights of inheritance were better defined by Hammurabi.

And yet when the most generous recognition of the best features of Hammurabi's Code has been made, the candid scholar must accord to the law of Moses a position far above the ancient Babylonian system.

In the Mosaic scheme the first and greatest commandment is, "Thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. 6:5), and the second is like it in both form and spirit, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Lev. 19:18). All the ethical precepts and legal enactments of the Pentateuch strike their roots down into the fertile soil of these two commandments. Religion and conduct are vitally related in the Bible. A man must do what is just and right because he worships a just and holy God. As his knowledge of God increases, his ethical standards are raised, and the Bible contains a progressive revelation attaining finality in Jesus Christ.

V. THE CODE OF HAMMURABI AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

As it is the purpose of the author of this article to discuss this subject at greater length at a later time, only a few conclusions are here briefly stated.

1. The historicity of the patriarchal stories receives the support that comes from agreement with a contemporary witness. The story of Abraham and Hagar, of the purchase of the cave of Machpelah, of the wooing of Rebekah, of the threatened burning of Tamar, and other

incidents in Genesis agree with the customs of the Babylonian world. Babylonian influence was supreme in Canaan in the days of Abraham and for centuries afterward.

2. The influence of Hammurabi's Code was as powerful on the earlier laws in the Pentateuch as upon the later. The attempt to prove that the priestly legislation shows greater indebtedness to Hammurabi than Deuteronomy or the Book of the Covenant has signally failed. It is not at all certain that Moses borrowed anything directly from Hammurabi's Code. The most conservative scholar ought to have no objection to borrowing from such a venerable monument, if the evidence should point in that direction.

3. The discovery of the existence of an extensive written code of laws in the Semitic world almost a thousand years before Moses, has put a severe strain upon the theory of the late origin of the Pentateuchal codes.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Theism.

By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University, comprising the Deems Lectures for 1902. American Book Company, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

This work is a revision and extension of Dr. Bowne's previous work on the Philosophy of Theism. He tells us that he availed himself of the opportunity to deliver the Deems Lectures before the New York University to revise and enlarge the original work. This volume is one of the clearest and most trenchant of recent works on theism. Dr. Bowne is master of a remarkably lucid style. He goes straight to his point and always states it with great force. The peculiar interest which attaches to this discussion is that it is to a very large extent a criticism and discussion of theistic logic as such. In this review, therefore, it will perhaps be of greatest interest to consider briefly some of his fundamental positions and criticisms of the theistic process. His general standpoint is that of Kant, who rejected the ontological argument for the existence of God, as proving nothing, and held that the teleological and cosmological depend upon the ontological. Dr. Bowne holds that we cannot prove the existence of God and maintains that the belief in God is "a formulation and expression of life rather than a syllogistic and academic inference; and it depends for its force on the energy of the life that produces it." He says, "If we say that theism is strictly proved by nothing, we must also admit that it is implicit in everything." "The mind is not a disinterested logic machine, but a living organism with manifest interests and tendencies. The implicit aim in mental development is to recognize these

interests and make room for them." Thus arises a series of ideals, cognitive, moral, and religious. To satisfy these ideals, to justify them, is the function of logic; but these are produced under the stress of experience. God is revealed to some extent in the Universe, but a purely logical and objective contemplation of the known facts would leave us in great uncertainty, the author holds. Dr. Bowne objects to including intuitions and fundamental postulates of the mind in the term reason, confining the term in his discussion to the faculty of inference through argument. He says, replying to those who object to the position that the existence of God cannot be proven, "We may say that private prejudices, whims and desires can never be any proper ground for belief, but the great catholic interests and tendencies of the race may well be a good ground for belief. For these reveal the essential structure and needs of the mind. They are made for us rather than by us and cannot be discredited without involving our whole system of knowledge in disaster." He says, "all hope of deduction and logical demonstration, then, must be given up. All that thought, scientific or religious, can hope to do is to interpret experience. It seeks to explain or clarify or systematize the matter given in experience. The only function of religious thought is to interpret man's religious experiences, not to demonstrate abstract theorems. Our final trust in the results reached rests on the mind's basal faith in the essential truthfulness of life and reality. The function of logic, then, is not constitutive but regulative. It is to bring the fundamental postulates of the mind into clear consciousness and keep them from losing their way." Near the conclusion of the introductory chapter Dr. Bowne says, "We do not purpose, then, to prove the divine existence, but rather to purpose a solution of the problem which the world and life force upon us, or to

offer an interpretation of experience in which the soul can rest.

The above statements and quotations will suffice to indicate to the reader the general position of the author. In the succeeding chapters the discussion deals with "The Unity of the World-Ground," "The World-Ground as Personal," "The Metaphysical Attributes of the World-Ground," "God and the World," "The World-Ground as Ethical," "Theism and Life."

Every one will gladly recognize the service which Prof. Bowne renders to the cause of theistic thinking in the emphasis which he places upon the practical as distinguished from the theoretical reason, although many will be unable to go the entire length with him. No one of course expects mathematical demonstration in the realm of theology and practical life, and all will at once concede the point that such demonstration is impossible when we are trying to prove the existence of God. But it cannot be so readily granted that God's existence cannot be proved in any sense, and it is very doubtful whether the function of logic is merely interpretative. Dr. Bowne reproaches frequently what he designates as the method of "rigor and vigor," but it would have been an advantage to his discussion if he had indicated more definitely what he means by proof. It is illegitimate to separate the practical from the intellectual interests in man's nature. The practical interests and movements would be paralyzed if unattended by intelligence. Of course all reasoning proceeds upon fundamental assumptions, but this is true of mathematics as well as of reasoning in a moral sphere, and so far as Prof. Bowne's arguments directed against this point are concerned, they will apply to mathematical demonstration as well as to reasoning about God. The practical necessities of man's nature and his ideals, which constitute the basis of Dr. Bowne's theory as to the knowledge of God, are them-

selves premises from which man reasons about God. They are of course distinguishable from reason as such, but they are not separable from reason in the thorough-going manner indicated by Dr. Bowne. Man's practical needs require his intelligence as their guide. Man's intelligence cannot proceed in any manner which ignores these practical needs. Man's nature is a unit. The dualism introduced by Kant cannot be permanently maintained.

Another point needs emphasis. Those who reason as Dr. Bowne does seem to imagine that they have destroyed the force of the theistic proofs by taking them up one by one and showing how inconclusive they are when viewed separately. As a matter of fact the argument for the existence of God is cumulative and it is also very complex, and properly grasped must include all the factors of thought and life. But life itself as a factor is material for thought and without thought cannot bring us the knowledge of God.

Of course the argument for the existence of God is inferential, but it has not been shown that such arguments never lead to certain conclusions. If so, then it would seem that skepticism would invade life at every point. It would be well if the different kinds of proof could be more strictly defined than is done in this volume.

It may be well to state the case a little less technically, even at the risk of some slight repetition.

The sum of Prof. Bowne's contention is that we believe in God not because we can prove His existence but because we need Him. He is the only answer to the total demand of our nature as men. The mind rests in no other conclusion. But even thus Prof. Bowne does not escape from the theistic inference nor fail to rest his case on such an inference. He only starts with a new premise. It is hard to see how ultimately the "practical reason" can escape from the usual conditions of other forms of

deduction. This is true even of the masses of men who carry out the process in only an implicit manner. This is not to say that the moral nature of man with its practical needs is identical with the intellectual, but only that it is inseparable from it in its action.

The theological argument does not prove God, it is urged, but only a being with contriving skill equal to the product. A fly gives evidence of design, but, says Prof. Bowne, a fly does not prove a God, but only at best "a fly-maker." Waiving the question whether even a fly-maker could be less than a God it is to be said that the full force of the inference from design is not exhausted in the case of the fly. The fly-maker is also an elephant-maker and a man-maker, and a planet-maker, and a sun-maker, and so on to the end. You must account for design in all the littleness and bigness of the world in the merely physical sense, and also all the evidence contained in the moral and aesthetic and intellectual powers of man. To these must be added the argument from causation, and all the evidence from the unity and vastness and variety of the universe. When so much of the circle of proof has been traversed at least a step or two has been made in advance of Prof. Bowne's conception of a fly-maker. For most people a God will be the only explanation adequate to all the facts. When to the above facts are added those on which Prof. Bowne so insists, the "Catholic interests," or urgent moral needs, or practical demands of men; and when, unlike Prof. Bowne, the reasoner employs these as the basis of an additional argument to "prove" a God, a conviction will very likely spring up in the mind.

But after all, it is urged, in reply, the fly-maker has not by the above process become an *infinite* and *absolute* being, but only the maker of an innumerable multitude of flies a very great swarm of them, so to speak. After all we are compelled to fall back upon our "Catholic interests," the "urgent practical demands" of life for a real

basis for our belief in God. Our practical demand for God is our best warrant for believing in him. So it is insisted by Prof. Bowne and others who go to so great length with Kant. But look at the point more closely: Do we in our "Catholic interests" and practical needs demand an infinite and absolute being? Prof. James and others think not. All we need is a being who can command us and whom we can "trust for the next step." Some being great enough to take care of us in a finite world. The dangers are not infinite. They are no bigger than the biggest flies in the swarm. It turns out then, after all, that we no more arrive at the idea of God by eschewing argument and trusting our "catholic interests" alone than otherwise. Man's merely "practical" demands are satisfied by a being far below the infinite. Thus it appears that the "practical reason" smuggles into the result as much that is illegitimate as, it is alleged, the theoretical is guilty of doing.

Another fallacy lurks in the mode of reasoning we are considering. It assumes that the demands of the intellect of man lie outside the range of his "catholic interests" and "practical needs." The truth is that the craving for intellectual satisfaction is as fundamental and persistent as any impulse in man's nature. It cannot be ignored by any system of thought which hopes to retain a permanent hold on the world. There are limits to knowledge in all directions of course. But this is the only form of "agnosticism" which is tenable. The modern philosophic agnosticism which figures in theology as well as elsewhere is already passing away, as was inevitable from the beginning. If man is made in the image of God, then he has powers capable of rising to God. Philosophic agnosticism, which pronounces man's intellect incompetent in the realm of theology really degrades man to a lower plane of being than the human. For the characteristic of man is that he is made in God's image

and likeness. This kinship is the basis of intercourse and fellowship, intellectual and otherwise, between God and man. The practical demands and "catholic interests" of man therefore include his intellect as well as his moral nature. We do not know fully of course. The reason has not "sêarched out the Almighty unto perfection." But it knows him really. This is not the place of course to dwell upon the question how infinity is ascribed to God or how the human mind attains to that idea.

E. Y. MULLINS.

Old Testament Prophecy.

By the late A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. Edited by J. A. Paterson, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 153-157 Fifth Avenue. 1903.

The present writer first heard of A. B. Davidson when, in the fall of 1882, he undertook the study of Hebrew under the brilliant G. W. Riggan. The text-book for beginners was Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar, a manual which has passed through many editions and guided the studies of thousands of theological students. The sincere respect inspired by that first acquaintance with the work of this distinguished Hebraist has deepened with the passing years. Dr. Davidson's commentaries on Job and Ezekiel in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges are perhaps the best in that excellent series. In brief compass they give English readers the results of profound and accurate scholarship and the finest exegetical insight. Davidson's Hebrew Syntax, which appeared in 1894, is a worthy companion to his Introductory Hebrew Grammar. The student who masters these manuals is ready for Hebrew exegesis.

Dr. Davidson did not publish as much through the years as his many admirers could have wished. Occasional articles in the *Expositor* and other journals re-

vealed such a wealth of Biblical learning, such sanity of view and such a firm grasp upon the great verities of Revelation that Old Testament students were hungry for more from this Nestor of Hebrew learning. Moreover there were echoes of the remarkable lectures delivered from year to year in the New College. It was known that A. B. Davidson was the peer of any living Old Testament scholar.

Since the lamented death of Professor Davidson in January, 1902, the treasures hid away in his desk have been rapidly coming to light in attractive volumes. In addition to "Literary and Theological Essays" two series of sermons have been published, the first entitled "The Called of God," and the second "Waiting Upon God." These sermons are rich in exegetical insight, profound in knowledge of God and man and attractive in literary style. The preacher's message abides in the mind to bless the life. Had Dr. Davidson entered the pulpit instead of the class-room, he might have taken rank with Alexander Maclaren.

The elaborate and informing article on Prophecy in Hastings' Bible Dictionary is from Dr. Davidson's pen. He also wrote on Angels, Covenant, Eschatology of the Old Testament and God.

Toward the close of 1903, Professor Paterson published Dr. Davidson's lectures on Old Testament Prophecy. Then all men could understand why the students of New College spoke in such glowing terms of the effect of these lectures on their thinking. Professor Paterson's opening sentence whets the reader's appetite for the coming feast: "Old Testament Prophecy was Dr. Davidson's favourite study; and the final results of forty years' strenuous thinking on this profoundly interesting subject are contained in the present volume."

Many peculiar features go to make this the most interesting and readable of all the extensive works on

Prophecy. Nor do we exclude from comparison the eloquent lectures of W. Robertson Smith, the brilliant exponent of Radical Criticism, and Professor A. F. Kirkpatrick's excellent volume on "The Doctrine of the Prophets." Dr. Davidson is the best representative of the criticism which seeks to glean from the researches of thoroughgoing critics in Germany and elsewhere all that is true, while at the same time holding with firm grasp the essential doctrines of the Christian faith. He is so fair and sympathetic in his statement of the views of the radicals and of the conservatives that both sides are disposed to claim him, radical critics rejoicing that he accepts the principles and canons of the most fearless criticism, and conservative scholars rejoicing that he teaches with such ability the doctrine of the supernatural in the Old Testament. While magnifying the human element in the religion of Israel, he believes thoroughly that Jehovah appeared to Abraham, and that the true prophets received their messages from God.

The literary style of these lectures is characterized by simplicity, perspicuity and directness. Though freighted with thought, each sentence is perfectly clear, and the reader is drawn forward from sentence to sentence and from one paragraph to another, his interest never flagging for a moment. Epigrams flash from almost every page, and yet there is no evidence of striving for effect. These brilliant compressed statements of truth are the result of a lifetime of strenuous thinking and of repeated efforts to give the most perfect expression to the truth about God and salvation. Perhaps the closing paragraph of the lecture on the Servant of the Lord expresses Dr. Davidson's mature conviction of the importance of cultivating vigor and brilliancy of style. "The writers of Scripture certainly do not despise literary splendour, nor do they consider it superfluous, much less injurious. Their whole minds, intellect, and imagination

are consecrated to God, and inspired by Him. The Scriptures, besides being the word of God, are splendid creations of mind; and perhaps in our religious compositions we might with advantage keep the example of the prophets before us, for they show us that truth may be allied with the highest literary power and brilliancy without any detriment to the truth."

Dr. Davidson quotes from the Bible quite frequently, often giving a new translation of the Hebrew and always placing the words of Scripture in such a setting that their import is clear. Only once, so far as we have observed, does he burden the reader with the labor of looking up a series of references. No doubt this insertion of the words of Scripture was primarily for the convenience of the lecturer; it certainly ministers to the convenience of the reader.

Professor Davidson seldom quotes from other scholars, though every lecture gives evidence of the wide reading that lies back of it. He dealt with ideas on their own merits, quite apart from the personalities that always intrude when an author's views are quoted and criticised.

Dr. Davidson first treats of prophecy as a factor in human history and then as the dominating factor in Israel's history from the time of Moses onwards. "The history of Israel is a history of prophecy." Dr. Davidson does not accept in all details the critical theory as to the composition of the Pentateuch, but he concedes far more to Wellhausen than conservative scholars deem wise. The history of the rise and development of prophecy in Israel is sketched by our author with the bold strokes of a master of history and of the art of expression. He regards the period of the Judges as the creative epoch of historical Israel. There followed another creative period when Samuel came on the scene. The relation of the prophets to the State in the different periods is thus described: "Samuel and the great prophets Eli-

jah and Elisha interfered directly in the government of the State; the former because in his day there was no king, and the latter because the kingship had become corrupt, and threatened, as in the case of Ahab, to destroy the fundamental principles of the constitution. But from Elisha downwards the prophets withdraw, in the main, from party strife. They no longer head revolutions. It began to appear to them that the State, as such, was hopelessly corrupt and must be destroyed; and so their interest in one king as against another ceases. They fall back entirely on moral means. They address the people as a whole. Such men as Isaiah and Jeremiah still give counsel to kings, but they never head political movements, or ally themselves with parties. From Amos downwards the prophets employ exclusively speech and writing."

The prophet is defined briefly as "*a speaker to men from God.*" "He could not be a prophet unless he spake to men; he could not be a prophet unless he spake from God."

Dr. Davidson presents a practically exhaustive discussion of the prophetic state and the prophetic style. "There was a connection between the Spirit of God and the mind of the prophet, but the connection was miraculous, and so evades definition. What is capable of definition only is the condition of the prophet." As to inspiration, Dr. Davidson, after weighing the arguments pro and con, states as the natural and proper conclusion, "we feel satisfied of the supernaturalness of the whole manifestation."

In explanation of the vivid pictures of nature as sympathizing in all her parts with man, Professor Davidson writes: "The great conception of the Old Testament is that the world is a moral constitution. Behind the physical world is God, a free, conscious, moral being; on this side of it, and over it, is man, another free, moral being. The world is but the means of their intercourse." Hence

the world rejoices in man's redemption and falls into dissolution in man's destruction under God's wrath.

Theological definition comes easy to Professor Davidson. "An allegory is a fiction that teaches a moral truth. A symbol is a fact that teaches a moral truth. A type is a fact that teaches a moral truth and predicts some actual realisation of that truth," How is this for a description of criticism? "All criticism is really an application of the principles of common sense by a person provided with the requisite knowledge of facts."

Dr. Davidson argues for two Isaiahs, and with much fairness and cogency. He tries to parry the argument drawn from the complete disappearance of all trace of Deutero-Isaiah by recalling the fact that the author of Job is unknown. He says, "In Hebrew literature there is a very strange and impressive impersonality." But this impersonality is not characteristic of the prophets, whose personal history is interwoven with their messages. The arguments for the unity of Isaiah have not been effectually disposed of by Professor Davidson.

Messianic Prophecy receives full treatment in these lectures. He regards the Servant of the Lord as "Israel according to its idea," "an ideal being, inner Israel in the heart of the phenomenal or actual Israel." Delitzsch's illustration of the pyramid as representing the varying uses of the word servant in Isaiah 40-66 seems better,—at the base Israel as a nation, higher up the pious kernel, the spiritual Israel, at the apex the second Israel, an individual.

This is a book to study. The author would not have desired the acceptance of its opinions solely on the authority of his great name.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies.

By A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Assyriology in University of Oxford. 12 mo. Cloth, 75 cents net. Fleming H. Revell Co. New York and Chicago.

In this little book the author of "Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments," etc., puts into popular form the most important results of recent archaeological discoveries bearing on the age, historicity and authenticity of the Old Testament. It is a sort of summary of his previous works, with a supplementary showing the testimony of the monuments up to date. His work is timely both because recent discoveries of this sort have been so numerous, unexpected and upsetting as regards certain theories and "results" of Higher Criticism, and because the controversies which Professor Friedrich Delitzsch's *Babel* and *Bibel* has occasioned have awakened a new and worldwide interest in the subject. As usual the author aims not a few shafts at the school of sceptical theorists who have "arrogated the title of 'critics' to themselves;" and in his array of "monument facts over against their "critical fancies," certainly puts a poser to them. The result is that, despite the bias of a specialist and certain needless repetitions, he puts the conservative case, for the most part, in well compressed and convincing form.

There is only one way, he says, in which our studies are likely to end in true results, and that is by excluding from them as far as possible what the Germans would call the subjective element. As to ancient history, there is only one test of its truthfulness which is scientifically acceptable. That test is contemporaneous evidence. In other words the more archaeological and the less philological our evidence is the greater will be its claim to scientific authority. So he rules "the philologist pure and simple" out of court.

Touching the appeal of criticism to the doctrine of evolution he is equally positive. That evolution has been

a potent factor in the history of man no sane thinker will deny. That there is evolution in the world of thought and ideas as well as in the world of material objects is undeniable, "but to trace the evolution generally needs more knowledge than we possess." Over against the contention that the development of religious ideas in Israel or elsewhere *must* have followed certain lines, he sets in array the recent archaeological discoveries which have shattered similarly subjective theories of development in Egypt and the early Greek world, and concludes that, unsupported by archaeological facts, all theories about the evolution of ideas, religious or otherwise, are absolutely valueless. Between "these two utterly opposed methods," one objective, the other subjective, one resting on a basis of verifiable facts, the other on the unsupported assumptions of the modern scholar, the one the method of archaeology and the other of "the so-called 'Higher Criticism.'" he maintains, the scientifically trained mind can have no hesitation in choosing.

Testing the tree of "Higher Criticism," then, by its fruits, he renders the verdict that "critical" method is "scientifically unsound, and its 'results' are unreliable; he affirms that it is quite as much of an artificial creation as the Ptolemaic system, and predicts that with its disappearance will disappear also the "historical conclusions" that have been derived from it—all must go with "the foundation of sand" upon which they have been built.

The details of fact and argument are presented in eight chapters that make most interesting reading. Among the subjects dealt with are "The Dissection of the Pentateuch," "The Fourteenth Chapter of Genesis and the Trustworthiness of the Old Testament History," "The Laws of Amraphel and the Mosaic Code," "The Geography of the Pentateuch," "Hebrew and Babylonian Cosmology," and "The Doctrine of Religious Evolution."

In dealing with certain "Critical Assumptions" the author dares to say that the whole application of a supposed law of evolution to the religious and secular history of the ancient Oriental world is founded on what we now know to have been a huge mistake. The Mosaic age, instead of coming at the dawn of the ancient Oriental culture, really belongs to the evening of its decay. The Hebrew legislator was surrounded on all sides by the influences of a decadent civilization. Religious systems and ideas had followed one another for centuries; the ideas had been pursued to their logical conclusions, and the systems had been worked out in a variety of forms. The actual condition of the Oriental world in the age of Moses, as it has been revealed to us by archaeology, leaves little room for the particular kind of evolution of which the 'higher criticism' has dreamed. In truth the archaeological discoveries of the last half a dozen years in Egypt and Krete have once for all discredited the claim of 'criticism to apply its theories of development to the settlement of chronological and historical questions. The awakening has come with a vengeance. The spade of the excavator has effected more in three or four years than the labors and canons of the 'critic' in half a century. The whole fabric he has raised has gone down like a house of cards, and with it the theories of development of which he felt so confident.

This critic of the 'critics' would not have us believe, however, that he is disingenuous enough to pretend that the work of the 'critic' has been "altogether barren." This is far from being the case. We have only to compare a history of early Greece as it was written a hundred years ago, with the history of early Greece as it is being written by archaeology to-day, to see how much there was which needed to be cleared away. "We can never return to the point of view of our forefathers in regard either to Greek or Hebrew history."

Within the lawful domain of philology, the critics' work has been fruitful. We have by his help come to take a truer view both of the text of the Old Testament and of the literature to which it belongs. We have learned that the Old Testament Scriptures are as truly a literature as the classical productions of Greece and Rome, that they were written by men, not by machines, and that they reflect the individual qualities of those who wrote them, and the coloring of the various ages at which they were composed. We have learned that heathen theories of inspiration ought to have no place in the Christian consciousness, that in our sacred books there is a human element as well as a divine. But between the recognition of the human element in the Old Testament and the 'critical' contention that the Hebrew Scriptures are filled with 'myths' and 'historical blunders,' 'pious frauds' and 'ante-dated documents,' the author rightly contends, the distance is very great.

The book concludes with the words of Canon Liddon in reference to the 'critical' theory of the origin of the Pentateuch which "still hold good:" "How is such a supposition reconcilable with the authority of him who has so solemnly commended to us the Books of Moses, and whom Christians believe to be too wise to be himself deceived, and too good to deceive his creatures?"

It will provoke and reward study.

GEORGE BOARDMAN EAGER.

Gladstone.

By John Morley. Macmillan Co. \$10.50 net.

Morley's *Life of Gladstone* is almost a library. The three massive volumes cover nearly two thousand closely printed pages. One naturally shrinks a little from what really appears to be an undertaking, unless he has much leisure. One needs a solid week with nothing else to do

and take his time with the masterly work of Mr. Morley. You cannot conquer a mountain at a dash, but some mountains are worth conquering. It may be asked if the work is not drawn out too thin. It is leisurely done, to be sure, but there is no filling in just to be doing it. On the other hand you are conscious of distinct restraint and repression on the author's part. Every page bears the mark of careful selection of material, condensation, and concentration. The author says that he could easily have expanded these volumes into a hundred. To an American there is, perhaps, an excess of politics, but this is not true from an English point of view, as already twenty thousand copies have been sold. And politics filled the center of Gladstone's active life, though not the center in his own mind. Religion was ever with him the main thing. He early pondered the question of being a clergyman, but concluded that he could serve the Church better in Parliament than in pulpit. His conception of service to the Church of England held him in public life at times when his natural inclinations were for retirement.

The Gladstones represent the combination of Scotch Highlander and Lowlander. Sir John Gladstone was one of the great Liverpool merchant princes. His paternal grandmother was "a woman of great energy." His mother was a Robertson of Dingwall, Scotland. Gladstone's life nearly spanned the nineteenth century. He was born December 29, 1809, and died May 19, 1898. He rose to the topmost round of the century, and no man of this great century surpassed him in character or achievement.

In Oxford young Gladstone met an atmosphere just the reverse of Liverpool. Oxford put its stamp upon him deep and strong. He had the marks of the fourth century ecclesiastic and was a loyal Churchman. The Oxford movement left its influence on him also, for he was a Puseyite to the end, though he shrank with horror from

the course of Newman and his dear friends Manning and Hope in going over to Romanism. He was an English Catholic, but not a Roman Catholic. His friendship in later years for Dr. Doellinger, the old Catholic scholar, did not diminish his abhorrence for the errors of Romanism. But Mr. Gladstone, while a resolute churchman, was able to be a friend to the non-conformists, who became in after years his most devoted adherents. Both Oxford and Liverpool are in Gladstone's composition. He will be the keenest dialectician and the most brilliant financier of his time. He was a double-first at Oxford and he was a double-first everywhere.

He entered Parliament in 1832 at the age of 23, and was a strict Tory representing Newark. It is a long race from this brilliant young Tory to the Grand Old Man who dies in 1898, the Liberal leader who has battled so grandly for the relief of Ireland. He was often twitted with inconsistency, and his reply was that while he began life opposed to freedom, he came to advocate freedom as the ruling principle in his political life. He at first opposed the abolition of slavery in Jamaica, opposed the admission of Dissenters to the universities, and was a strong protectionist. In time he came to be the champion of liberty in state and school and trade. In 1834 he became a member of Peel's Government, and for sixty years he is in office most of the time with Peel, with Palmerston, and four times as Premier himself. For eighteen years he represented Oxford, but with the opposition of the University boards, who dreaded his growing liberalism, and who finally defeated him. But Leeds and the Midlothian gave him a seat in Parliament.

Perhaps in nothing did the intellectual supremacy of Gladstone appear to better advantage than in his budgets as Chancellor of the Exchequer. They were marvels of detail and comprehension, and his speeches were wonders of clearness and persuasiveness. He

really took the ideas of Cobden on free trade and put them so that they could carry conviction. The great deeds that give glory to Mr. Gladstone's name are bewildering. Mr. Morley has had to write a history not only of English legislation from 1832 to the close of the century, but of European diplomacy and wars, for in all of them Gladstone was a factor, and often the dominant factor. It was Gladstone who attracted the attention of Western Europe to the pitiable plight of Greece, and he is loved to this day by Greece and the minor Balkan states. It was Gladstone who exposed the outrages of the King of Naples on his political prisoners, and made it possible for Cavour, Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel to gain sympathy for Italian unity. The disestablishment of the Irish church, the extension of the suffrage, opening of the universities to Dissenters, all found strong support in him. He electrified all Europe as he cried out against the unspeakable Turk. He grappled with the education problem in 1870, and the result was a compromise, and England is again in the throes of a mighty conflict on this subject. At that time Joseph Chamberlain was a doughty champion of the Nonconformist contention. Chamberlain helped to break up the Liberal party on the Irish question. Will he do the same for the Conservative party now with his protection views?

Mr. Gladstone was cautious, and tried to look at all sides of a subject. He was often called vacillating and over-refined because he saw distinctions that others did not see. Sometimes his official acts were in large measure due to the work of his predecessors, as in Egypt and South Africa. Mr. G. Morley clearly shows that Gladstone is not responsible for Gordon's death at Khartoum nor the disaster of Majuba hill.

The most exciting part of his career is when Disraeli is his rival. There was sharp rivalry and genuine antipathy between these two brilliant men. When they met in

debate, it was worth while to be in the House of Commons. Mr. Morley's style is good always, but he is really eloquent when he depicts Gladstone as a Demosthenes.

Gladstone and the Queen differed sharply at times, but there was always courtesy and deference. As he became more and more liberal, she seemed to fear his democratic tendencies, while Disraeli accented the power of the throne.

The greatest blow that ever befell Gladstone was the disgrace of Parnell. Even after this unspeakable calamity, he was able to carry Irish Home Rule in the House of Commons, though it was thrown out in the House of Lords. He was too old, now 85, to go on with the struggle, and Roseberry soon gave up the reigns of government. But the Home Rule conflict will illustrate the fearlessness of the man, his supreme courage and his convictions, his masterful efforts to move men to action. To-day the Irish are demanding Home Rule of the Conservatives, and they may get it or force the government to resign. Gladstone was a great worker, sometimes working fourteen hours a day. But he had a magnificent constitution. Hawarden, with its fresh air and glorious trees, was a blessing to him. He could fell trees and so forget cares of state.

It would not be just to close even a brief discussion of Gladstone without speaking of his love of Aristotle, Dante, Augustine, and Butler; "my four doctors," he lovingly called them, each a master in his realm. He really had five doctors, for Homer was a passion with him. Gladstone wrote on Homer for love of it. His controversial writings as against the papacy and Huxley reveal the ecclesiastical side of his life. The great men and women of his time move before us in these volumes in stately array, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning, Peel, Palmerston, Disraeli, Bright, Salisbury, Queen Victoria, and all the rest. But in the great Victorian era no voice was

more eloquent, more commanding, more noble, more unselfish, than that of W. E. Gladstone, the greatest statesman of his day, if not of all English history.

Mr. Morley is not a Christian, and yet he has faithfully portrayed the intensity of Gladstone's religious nature; has, in fact, given his piety as the key to his career. It would have been better if a Christian could have written this life. But when all is said, one wonders if Mr. Morley has not done better by Gladstone than any other Englishman of the day. It is a treasure-house for future generations.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Life and Teachings of Abbas Effendi;

A study of the religion of the Babis, or Beha'is. Founded by the Persian Bab and his successors, Beha Ullah and Abbas Effendi. By Myron H. Phelps, of the New York Bar; with an Introduction by Edward Granville Browne, M.A., M.R.A.S., Fellow of Pembroke College, etc. G. Putnam's Sons. New York and London. 1903. Pp. xliii, 259.

Not every new religion can command for its promulgation the services of a Cambridge professor, a member "of the New York Bar," and a first class publisher. This is the good fortune of Babism, or, as we are now to designate it, after "the Supreme Manifestation," Beha'ism.

The book is in several ways remarkable and thoroughly interesting. It exhibits five remarkable men and two interesting women, and a religion; or to be more exact, it gives views of all these. To this writer the most interesting of these are the author and his sponsor, Prof. Browne, both of whom are quite remarkable for the child-like docility and eagerness with which they associate themselves with Babism and patronize its leaders. The professor, indeed, takes to himself no little credit as the discoverer to the Western nations of this sorely needed light, new risen in the East, and as a longtime seer of its coming glory, now at length so far realized that we can be assured of the "remarkable triumph of the Beha'i religion"

whereby "is the marvelous success achieved in recent years by its missionaries in the United States of America, where, as I understand, the number of believers may now be counted by thousands, not confined to one state or city, but represented in almost all the more important towns," which surprising information (?) suggests that unless the enthusiastic professor knows more of Beha'ism than of the United States, his condemnation of Christians in comparison with Beha'is is not so fatal after all.

Mr. Phelps also writes an "Introduction," which is valuable in that it discloses his opportunities and qualifications for the service of presenting the "Life and Teachings" of "the Master of Akka." He gives in this Introduction a sketch of the rise of Babism, "inaugurated in 1844 by one Ali Mohammed * * * who in that year announced himself the 'Bab,' " signifying "an avenue for the transmission to men of messages from a superhuman source." Before his martyr death, 1850, the Bab conferred upon Mirza Haseyn Ali the title of "Beha Ullah" (Glory of God), who came to be regarded as the "Supreme Manifestation" of God, and was, after much persecution and after being held under civil restraint for many years until his death at Akka, 1902, succeeded in the leadership of the Faith by his son, Abbas Effendi.

Mr. Phelps tells us that in 1902, in London, he became interested in Beha'ism. From the writings of Prof. Browne he acquainted himself with "the history of the movement, and the tenets of the religion." Outside the writings of the Cambridge professor he does not seem to have cared to extend his investigations. But he now determined upon a personal study of the "Master," and succeeded in spending in the "city" of Akka "the month of December, 1902." He tells us: "This month was one of the most memorable in my life; for not only was I able to gain a satisfactory general view of this religion, but I made the acquaintance of Abbas Effendi, who is easily

the most remarkable man whom it has ever been my fortune to meet."

But we must not suppose that Mr. Phelps had constant access to the "Master." Indeed he seems to have seen him but seldom, and to have conversed with him next to none at all. Here the women come into the story. The Abbas allowed his sister to accommodate the inquirer with an account of their father, and incidentally of himself. But we are again to be told that "As the restrictions of Mohammedan social custom, which the Beha'is in Akka carefully observe for the sake of peace and harmony, prevented me from meeting this lady personally; this narrative was given by her in installments to Madame M. A. de S. Cannavarro, who was in Akka at the same time that I was, and by her repeated to me. Each installment was written a few hours after it was received from Behiah Khanum." And this is the inspiring spectacle of an American gentleman getting from the Persian "Master," through his sister by means of the Countess Cannavarro a piecemeal story that has brought great consolation to his restless heart. It is altogether fitting that the Countess should be rewarded with the dedication to her of the volume.

Some interesting inconsistencies in the women's story seem entirely to have escaped their pupil, as also does his infatuation for Abbas Effendi allow him to overlook the fact that what Mr. Phelps designates "The Story of His Life" is really the story of Beha Ullah.

Some other significant marks of the author's fitness are his personal ignorance of the number and character of Behai's in Persia and his confession that one of his own most important representations of the faith is contradicted by the published works of adherents of the faith. Most striking of all is his information that during the career of Bab "an era of bloody and relentless persecution followed, which has not, perhaps, been paralleled

in history. The number of martyrdoms which have taken place in Persia has been estimated at ten thousand." One wonders where and when Mr. Phelps read history.

Having gotten the life story in the manner indicated, the author gives us his own conclusions as to the "characteristics" of Abbas Effendi, the "Philosophy and Psychology," "Ethics and Conduct," and the "Nature" of Beha'ism. Here, however, the author takes his understanding of Abbas Effendi's teaching as the common teaching of the faith, a course not justified by the facts. The author's acquaintance does not extend beyond Abbas Effendi and the "sixty or seventy" followers assembled with him in Akka. Next he gives us a collection of "Discourses" by the "Master."

In all this exposition there is much to commend and something to learn. Abbas Effendi seems to have in his deepest thinking a base of Hindu pantheistic mysticism; on this he has erected a disproportionate structure of mixed spiritualistic and naturalistic evolution. In the whole is a large element of Christian ethics. These elements have not been assimilated nor mentally articulated. The ethical teachings are usually of a high order, but almost invariably display direct dependence on the Christian Scriptures, especially the Psalms and the teachings of Jesus and Paul. All this, by which the author was attracted, and vastly more he could have heard from any one of a hundred New York pulpits.

The volume lays special stress on the liberal attitude of this religion toward other faiths. He ignores three things: First, that the attitude of the political prisoner in Akka is not the same as that of the free devotees of the desert; second, that no faith which accounts all others as good can propagate itself; third, that there is an always implied and often expressed superiority in Beha'ism that speaks of intolerant pride.

A chapter of sayings ("Tablets") of Beha Ullah is

for some reason committed to small type. One quickly discovers that Beha Ullah had vastly different conceptions of God and his relations to men from those of Abbas Effendi. He was narrower, but more consistent and more truly spiritual.

The author gives us a *Conclusion* in which he displays a deep prejudice against Christianity and a morbid view of the religious hypocrisy of all Christian lands.

While one is bound in justice to expose the glaring weaknesses of this book, one must also gladly bear witness that it is admirably written with a splendid, if somewhat blind, enthusiasm, and that both in the criticisms of our own Faith and in the exposition of Beha'ism there are wholesome lessons, partly taught, more suggested, for Christians and Christian advocates.

W. O. CARVER.

The Atonement and the Modern Mind.

By James Denny, D.D. A. C. Armstrong & Son. New York. 1903.

This work, which has already appeared in the form of articles in *THE EXPOSITOR*, is intended as a supplement to *The Death of Christ* by the same author. The book was called forth by the criticisms and correspondence aroused by the first book, and was written with the avowed purpose of removing hindrances to the acceptance of the doctrine of the atonement by the modern mind. Dr. Denny believes in the atonement with all his might. "It is the most profound of all truths, and the most recreative. It determines, more than anything else, our conceptions of God, of man, of history, and even of nature. . . . It is the inspiration of all thought, the impulse and the law of all action, the key, in the last resort, to all suffering." p. 13. "For those who recognize it at all it is Christianity in brief; it concentrates in itself, as in a germ of infinite potency, all that the wisdom, power and love of

God mean in relation to sinful men." p. 14. These extracts will serve to show the profound belief of the author in the reality and importance of the atonement. "The cross of Christ is man's only glory, or it is his final stumbling-block." What the author seeks to do "is so to present the facts as to mediate, if possible, between the mind of our time and the atonement." p. 16.

The modern mind in so far as it differs from the universal mind of all ages, has been formed by the influence of the physical sciences, the idealistic philosophy and the historic study and spirit. The author maintains that "far more mind has had its characteristic qualities and temper imparted to it by scientific study than by study in any other field." This study, especially the study of biology, is favorable to the conception of the atonement in so far as it has emphasized the unity of life; but it has been unfavorable in its tendency to reduce the whole life to the lower plane of the physical. This ignores the highest and best in man. The idealistic philosophy "teaches the essential unity of God and man. Man is as necessary to God as God is to man. God is the truth of man, but man is the reality of God. God comes to consciousness of himself in man, and man in being conscious of himself is at the same time conscious of God." p. 46. Such a conception of the spiritual world renders the atonement unnecessary and impossible. To this conception the author offers the consciousness of Jesus Christ. Against that consciousness of self which can not be self-delusion, such a conception is shattered. The great historic movement of the nineteenth century has been unfavorable to a belief in the atonement, because it has been inclined to assert that whatever is historical can have no eternal significance. Jesus Christ appeared at a definite time and place, lived the life of the people and died an ordinary death at the hands of judicial executioners. It is impossible that he should have eternal significance. The author

properly answers that this does not follow. In making such an assertion history goes beyond its province.

Having pointed out the factors in modern culture which tend to prejudice the mind against the atonement, he takes up in the last two lectures the doctrine of the atonement. The objection to the doctrine on the ground that God forgives sin freely has no force, because we all agree that God forgives freely. The question is not as to whether God forgives freely, but as to what it costs him to do so. The author repudiates a forensic or legal or judicial conception of the atonement, because it rests upon a forensic or legal or judicial conception of man's relation to God. p. 69. These relations are first of all personal. "Religion is an experience of the personality of God, and of our own personality in relation to it." But in the second place they are universal, that is they are not independent of law. "The relations of God and man are not lawless, they are not capricious, incalculable, incapable of moral meaning; they are personal, but determined by something of universal import; in other words, they are not merely personal but ethical." pp. 67, 68. There is neither the weakness of an indulgent parent nor the indifference of an immoral one in God. His relations to men are necessarily ethical. In the third place they have been deranged by sin. "Sin is, in fact, nothing else than this derangement or disturbance; it is that in which wrong is done to the moral constitution under which we live." p. 79. The fact of sin can not be explained away, and there is an inevitable and vital connection between sin and death. Death is everywhere the penalty, the effect of sin. "The atonement, as the New Testament presents it, assumes the connection of sin and death. Apart from some sense and recognition of such connection, the mediation of forgiveness through the death of Christ can only appear an arbitrary, irrational, unacceptable idea." p. 108. To the question whether God can forgive sin, the

world has two answers. One class say forgiveness is impossible. This is a world of law and forgiveness is against nature. Nothing but eternal punishment is reasonable or possible. The other class emphasises the free personal element in God and asserts forgiveness for all because of God's nature. "The Christian religion teaches that forgiveness is mediated to sinners through Christ, and spiritually through his death." p. 112. There is both a divine and a human necessity for the atonement. God could not forgive otherwise, and man could not receive forgiveness mediated otherwise. "He stands in our stead, facing all our responsibilities for us as God would have them faced; and it is what he does for us, and not the effect which this produces in us, still less the fantastic abstraction of a 'racial act,' which is the atonement in the sense of the New Testament.

Dr. Denny has produced another strong book. He believes in the atonement profoundly and argues ably, but it is doubtful if he has made it any more acceptable to the modern mind. There is no place for an atonement in independent human thinking. It is a doctrine of the Bible, and as a rule it will be accepted, modified or rejected in proportion to the fulness and completeness of the acceptance of the Bible as a revelation from God. Dr. Denny admits that an *a priori* assertion of the necessity of an atonement would be highly presumptuous, but since the event it is not at all unreasonable. But the facts upon which the doctrine is based are found in the Bible, and hence a man must accept the Bible before he can accept an atonement.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Representative Modern Preachers.

By Lewis O. Brastow, D.D., Professor of Homiletics in the Yale Divinity School. The Macmillan Company. New York.

The preachers chosen for notice in this volume are Schleiermacher, F. W. Robertson, Bushnell, Beecher,

Brooks, John Henry Newman, Canon J. B. Mozley, Guthrie and Spurgeon. The author's sympathies with the school of thought represented in the first five of the list are very apparent, not only in the number of men chosen, but also in the treatment itself. These five represent the "Broad Church" or liberalistic wing in the modern pulpit, each, however, in his own way, for all were independent and vigorous men. Newman is taken to represent the "High Church" or extreme dogmatic group of preachers, those committed to the authority of creed and church. Mozley stands for the thoughtful and scholarly apologetic class of modern preachers who treat the fundamentals of Christianity in the light of modern thought and criticism and yet hold to them. Guthrie and Spurgeon are presented as specimens of the evangelical and evangelistic type.

The study of the preachers selected is careful, thorough, appreciative, and as impartial and judicial as could be expected from one who shows so plainly where his preferences lie, as has already been said. The criticism is both searching and able. The best and the weakest elements of the preachers are discovered clearly and frankly set forth. The studies of Schleiermacher, Robertson and Newman are particularly good, while all show both conscientious and scientific pains to get and tell the truth on each subject.

The literary quality of the book is disappointing. The class-room is much in evidence; the lectures "smell of the lamp" in preparation and suggest the air of a close room in delivery. The academician and lecturer stands confessed in every paragraph—the wearisome and unnecessary repetitions, the parental fondling of ideas already made plain, the deliberate style, redundant and sometimes involved, and the general over minuteness of the treatment, are all blemishes easily enough seen and rather unpleasantly felt in the reading of a really strong

and good book. In general the method is that of the dissecting room rather than that of the studio.

E. C. D.

A New New Testament, INTERLINEAR, WITH LEXICON AND SYNONYMS.

Hinds & Noble, New York. Cloth, \$4.00; Half leather, \$5.00; Divinity Circuit, \$6.00, less ten per cent., in each case, to ministers.

There are still many men who have not studied Greek in the schools, and who will not master it, who yet desire to be able to refer to the Greek Testament and to use commentaries making such references. In a few cases such men, by diligent study and constant care, are able to make highly profitable use of the Greek. The danger is that the man who depends only upon such information will in ignorance of his limitations make ridiculous and harmful misuse of Greek. While all are to be urged to gain thorough acquaintance with Greek and make constant use of it, one must not fail of fellowship in sympathy and work with such as cannot do so, and who yet seek to do their best. For these the very best helps should be provided. Hinds and Noble have made close study of the needs of this class and have employed competent scholarship in the preparation of this edition. The Greek text is that of Stephens, which is a little unfortunate, but the variations of all leading texts, except Westcott and Hort, are indicated in foot-notes. The authorized Version occupies the margin, while the literal translation underlies the Greek, line for line and word for word, so far as this can be. A good vocabulary-lexicon, specially prepared for this work, is a strong feature. A section setting forth some leading synonyms could have been fuller in detail and more comprehensive. Within its limits it is highly valuable.

For one who must use an interlinear New Testament, this is the one he will want.

W. O. CARVER.

China's Book of Martyrs.

By Luella Miner. Westminster Press, Philadelphia.

One of the most inspiring chapters in Christian history is the story of the long role of Christian martyrs. It is true that there has sometimes been wild fanaticism, sometimes cowardly renunciation in the hour of trial, but on the whole Christian men and women have faced the terrors of persecution with as much calmness and steadfastness as could be expected. Time has painted a halo of glory around the brow of the ancient martyrs until they seem to be exalted into another sphere far above us. But the last year of the nineteenth century has furnished its full quota of those who were faithful unto death; and that not among the enlightened men and women of the West, but among those but lately won from Confucius and Buddha in the far East. This book is the story of the martyr faith and martyr death of the native Christians, (not the missionaries) in China during the awful summer of 1900. We have seen substantially the same material before, but it is well to gather it into one volume that we may see at a glance the whole glorious story. There were lapses of course, there was no fanaticism. Every honorable effort was made by the native Christians to save themselves, but they met death calmly, fearlessly. The author estimates that thirty thousand native Christians perished with as much fortitude and hope as was ever shown by Western Christians. This is an inspiring book, full of excellent illustrations for the pastor and the missionary leader.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Dona Perfecta and El Nino de la Bola.

The American Book Company has just issued school editions of the "Dona Perfecta" of Galdos, and of "El Nino de la Bola" by Alarcon. These are quite popular

stories, in Spain and outside, and these texts are likely to prove useful. "*Dona Perfecta*," indeed, in the edition of Dr. Marsh has long been in the hands of the teacher and student of elementary Spanish throughout the country. The present text differs from this in one important particular: it has a very full (123 pp.) vocabulary, adapted to novices and a good bit of special work. The editor, Dr. Lewis, has, it seems, taken no care to use as a basis throughout, the tenth (and last) Spanish edition of Galdos' novel. The ninth has probably served his need. However, this will be of no serious disadvantage to the educational value of the book. "*El Nino*" (Schwill of Yale) is uniform with the above in fullness of vocabulary, paucity of notes—which are at the foot of the page—and excellence of typography. They are each furnished with a slight introduction, are bound in plain serviceable cloth, and are of handy size. "*El Nino*" is not given complete, and the author has had resort to the questionable method of interspersed synopses. They form, on the whole, respectable additions to the growing body of Spanish texts.

E. P. DARGAN.

How to Study Literature.

By Benjamin A. Heydrick, A.B. (Harv.), Professor of English Literature, State Normal School, Millersville, Pa. Hinds and Noble, Publishers. New York City.

This is a lucid and suggestive little volume of 150 pp. It is intended to be "a guide to the intensive study of literary masterpieces."

Part I. discusses the nature and classes of literature, and gives careful and detailed outlines for the appreciative study of the more prominent types of literary productions: Narrative Poetry, Lyric Poetry, Dramatic Poetry, Fiction, The Essay and The Oration.

Part II. applies the principles of Part I. to a half dozen specimens of literary masterpieces. There are brief and

helpful discussions of Figures of Speech and Versification. An extended and discriminating list of books recommended for study is given in the appendix.

The book will be very serviceable to those not fully initiated into the best methods and true spirit of literary interpretation. Teachers of English will find it fresh and suggestive.

BYRON H. DEMENT.

The Open Door.

By Henry Van Dyke. Published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, Pa.

This little book contains eight sermons by the distinguished preacher, author and professor. Dr. Van Dyke's pulpit style does not differ materially from that of his books. There is the same discriminating thought, the same penetrative imagination, the same simplicity and lucidity, the same cheery optimism, the same love of nature. He has the power of striking, convincing statement in a rare degree. He is sparing of illustration, not rich in imaginative adornments; but he is always suggestive, stimulating, helpful. The sermons are biblical without much quotation of the Bible, thoroughly evangelical, but expressed in language that appeals to the world of to-day. The first one on "The Open Door" which gives name to the volume is particularly fine. Other good ones are "Resurrection Now," "A Divine Impossibility," and "The Making of St. John."

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Ancient Sermons for Modern Times.

By Asterius, Bishop of Amasia circa 375-405 A.D. Translated by Galusha Anderson and E. J. Goodspeed. The Pilgrim Press. New York, Boston, Chicago.

In his Lectures on the History of Preaching Dr. Broadus called attention very warmly to Asterius, Bishop of Amasea (or Amasia?) in Pontus in the fourth century,

and expressed the hope that some one would sometime render a selection of his sermons into English. In the introduction to this little volume Dr. Anderson speaks of having been similarly impressed with the remarkable adaptness to modern conditions which he had found in Asterius. In bringing the matter to his class one of his pupils became interested enough to make a study of Asterius, and the result is this little volume of translations by Prof. Goodspeed.

Five sermons are selected from those given in Migne's Greek Patrology. The translation is very pleasing and satisfactory, carefully done and marked with a flowing clearness that leaves nothing to be desired. There is no mistaking the thought of the ancient author. As to the merits of the discourses themselves the opinions of Dr. Broadus and of Dr. Anderson are fully sustained. They are remarkable discussions of some of the fundamental and lasting principles of Christian ethics and thus applicable to human nature and needs in all times. But there is lack of the evangelical note. The sermon on covetousness is rich in thought and suggestion for our times. The book is well worth careful reading.

E. C. D.

Stories of the Bible.

By Myles Endicott. Educational Publishing Company, Boston, etc.

The several volumes of this work are done in admirable style with clear large type on a high grade of white paper and with numerous illustrations from the best sources, and each chapter is introduced with a poetical selection of merit and appropriateness.

The stories are simply told without undue effort to simplify such as one finds in too many books for children.

The stories are not always accurate in detail and the abridgement sometimes omits important items that should not be wanting in the child's first impressions. The Eng-

lish, with some faults, is yet usually dignified and attractive.

Children, young and older, will read or hear these stories with great interest and such volumes are essential to their proper education.

W. O. CARVER.

Kyrie Eleison.

A Manual of Private Prayers with Notes, etc. By H. J. Wotherspoon, M.A., of Edinburgh. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Short forms for private prayer are given for every day in the week, morning, midday and evening. The selections from generally accepted liturgical sources are well made and put together, and the prayers are full of a good devotional spirit. For those who find the spiritual life helped rather than hindered by liturgical suggestion this little manual will be of real service; and for those who prefer and practice the spontaneous expression of their own individual feelings in prayer there still may be found much of good and useful uplift and guidance in the book.

E. C. D.

Preaching.

A series of brief chapters. By Thomas McBride Nichols. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This does not profess to be an exhaustive or technical treatise but only a series of sketches, originally published as articles for a periodical and gathered into a brief compass in book form. The articles are bright, derived from experience, sensible and just. They contribute nothing especially new, striking or of unusual value to the well-worn subject of which they treat, but they are sound and sensible discussions of a topic of perennial interest to all, and many a pastor will feel refreshed and helped in taking hold of the fundamentals of his business afresh by the reading of this pleasing treatment of the matter.

E. C. D.

Columba.

American Book Co.

The American Book Company is producing some excellent editions of the classics in modern languages. One of these is Merimee's "Columba," edited, with introduction, notes and vocabulary, by Hiram Parker Williamson, of the University of Chicago. The binding is good, the type clear and attractive. Teachers will find this an excellent edition of this old classic.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

New Light on the New Testament.

By Parke P. Flournoy, D.D. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1903. Pp. xxi., 193.

The title page describes this little work as "An account of some interesting discoveries which bear important testimony as to the time when the gospels and other books of the New Testament were written." The author discusses with a fine enthusiasm the bearing of the manuscripts of Tatian's Diatessaron, the Apology of Aristides and the "Sinaitic Palimpsest" of the gospels on the question of the date of the composition of our gospels. He especially combats the views of "Supernatural Religion" and the Baur School.

While the volume contains nothing "new" to scholars it puts in popular and accessible form the important testimony of these relatively recent "finds" and will be welcome to many a layman and student. Other testimony is briefly discussed also.

Prof. Benj. B. Warfield, of Princeton, has written a vigorous Introduction in fine style wherein he warns the reader against undue valuation of all this kind of testimony. The question of the origin of our gospels he regards as settled and only confirmation can now be added, or refutation of temporary objections.

W. O. CARVER.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The following books have been received and will be reviewed in a later issue:

Vocal and Literary Interpretation of the Bible. By S. S. Curry, Ph.D., President of School of Expression, Boston. The Macmillan Co. New York.

New Light on the Life of Jesus. By Charles Augustus Brooks, D.D. Chas. Scribner's Sons. New York. 1904. 196 pages.

An Introduction to the Bible for Teachers of Children: a Manual for use in Sunday Schools or in the Home. By Georgia Louise Chamberlain, with an introduction by the editors. Constructive Bible Studies, Elementary Series. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1904. Pages xxxviii, 206. Price \$1.00.

The American Natural History; a Foundation of Useful Knowledge of the Higher Animals of North America. By Wm. T. Hornaday. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York. 1904. Pages 449. Price \$3.50, net.

The Gospels as Historical Documents, Part I. The Early Use of the Gospels. By V. H. Stanton, D.D., Ely Professor of Divinity, University of Cambridge. Divinity Press. 1903.

Critical Questions. Being a Course of Sermons Delivered in St. Mark's Church, Marlybone Road, N. W., 1903. London: S. C. Brown, Langham & Co., Ltd., 47 Great Russell St.

Tragedy of Julius Cæsar.

Tragedy of Hamlet.

Tragedy of King Lear.

Tragedy of Othello.

Tragedy of Macbeth. By William Shakespeare, Edited by W. J. Rolfe, Litt.D. With illustrations. American Book Co. New York.

Kindly Light. By Florence Morse Kingsley. Illustrated. Henry Altamus Co. Philadelphia.

A New Parliamentary Manual. By Edmond Palmer, Teacher of Civics and Economics in the Inglewood High School, Chicago, and member of the Chicago Bar. Hinds & Noble. New York.

Forms of English Poetry. By Charles F. Johnson, L.H.D., Professor of English Literature in Trinity College, Harvard. American Book Co. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

History of the English Bible, Extending from the Earliest Saxon Translations to the Present Anglo-American Revision. Second Edition, Revised, Illustrated, and Enlarged. By Blackford Condit, D.D. A. S. Barnes & Co. New York.

Why We Believe the Bible. By Henry Melville King, D.D. American Tract Society. New York.

A Short Introduction to the Literature of the Bible. By Richard G. Moulton, M.A. (Camb.), Ph.D. (Penn.), Professor of Literature (in English) in the University of Chicago, etc. D. C. Heath & Co. Boston.

Things Fundamental. By Charles Edward Jefferson, Pastor Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York.

Our New Edens. By J. R. Miller. Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. Philadelphia.

From Love to Praise. By Herrick Judson, D.D., LL.D. Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia.

Stories from Life. A Book for Young People. By Orrison Swett Marden. American Book Co. 240 pages.

The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Kingdom of God and the Church. By Geerhardus Vos, Ph.D., D.D. American Tract Society. New York.

The Tree in the Midst. By Greville McDonald. Armstrong & Son.

The Autobiography of Herbert Spencer. Two volumes. The Appletons. Price \$5.50 net, plus 40 cents postage.

The Well by the Gate. By M. W. Stryker, D.D., LL.D. Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. Philadelphia. 1903.

The Sinless Christ. George Tybant Purves, D.D., LL.D. Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. 1902.

The Ten Commandments. By R. W. Dale, D.D. Thomas Whittaker. New York.

Broader Bible Studies. The Pentateuch. By Rev. Alexander Paterson. George W. Jacobs & Co. Philadelphia.

Faces Toward the Light. By Sylvanus Stall. The Vir Publishing Co.

Self Help. By Samuel Smiles. American Book Co.

New Psychology. By J. P. Gordy, Ph.D., LL.D. Hinds & Noble.

Faith and Social Service. Thomas Whittaker. New York.

Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit. By Auguste Sabatier. McClure, Phillips & Co.

The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers. By Edward Caird. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons. 1904.

Balance: The Fundamental Verity. By Orlando J. Smith. Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Cardinal Newman. By William Barry. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1904.

Die Fugger in Rom von Dr. Aloys Schulte. Leipzig. 1904.

The United States in Our Own Time. By E. B. Andrews. Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1903.

19.50
2.75
1.25
2.60
1.35
1.50
35

21.00
27 80

6.80

The Baptist Review and Expositor (Quarterly)

Subscription price \$2.00 per year in advance. Single number 60 cents.

ADVERTISING RATES.

1 Page, 4x7 inches, one insertion	\$15.00
1 Page, four successive insertions	50.00
4 Pages, one insertion	50.00
½ Page, one insertion	8.00
½ Page, four insertions	30.00
¼ Page, one insertion	5.00
¼ Page, four insertions	17.00
⅛ Page, one insertion	3.00
⅛ Page, four insertions	10.00

A. T. ROBERTSON, Business Manager.

Norton Hall, S. B. T. Seminary,

LOUISVILLE, KY.

WESTERN RECORDER

LEADS THEM ALL.

\$2.00 PER YEAR.

SAMPLE COPY FREE.

WE ARE HEADQUARTERS FOR

SEMINARY BOOKS and all kinds of THEOLOGICAL BOOKS.

Large assortment of SONG BOOKS for Churches and Sunday Schools.

MODEL CHURCH ROLL AND RECORD only \$1.50.

MATTHEW HENRY'S Complete Commentary, 6 vol. \$7.20 net; 3 vol.

\$6.00 net.

WRITE FOR CATALOGUE.

BAPTIST BOOK CONCERN, Inc.

642 FOURTH AVENUE,

LOUISVILLE, KY.

COLPORTAGE HEADQUARTERS.

Books Published by the Sunday School Board.

SENT POSTPAID ON RECEIPT OF PRICE.

THE PASTOR AND THE SUNDAY SCHOOL. (Seminary Lectures.) W. E. Hatcher, D.D. Cloth, 12mo.; pp. 180. Price, 50 cents.

Many a pastor will feel a deep regret that he did not have it before he was ordained. The book will live. It meets the need of the times.—W. C. Taylor.

PASTORAL LEADERSHIP OF SUNDAY SCHOOL FORCES. (Seminary Lectures.) Rev. A. F. Schauffier, D.D. Cloth, 12mo.; pp. 176. Price, 50 cents. A great work by a great expert.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY SUNDAY SCHOOL. (Seminary Lectures.) Rev. S. H. Greene, D.D., LL.D., Pastor Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C. Cloth, 12mo. Price, 50 cents.

THE YOUNG PROFESSOR. A Story of Bible Inspiration. Eldridge B. Hatcher, Cloth, 12mo.; illustrated; pp. 503. Price, \$1.25.

"The author has produced a live and living book. Though in the nature of a story, its theme is lofty and commanding—God's authorship of the Bible. A strong book on inspiration—a work of easy reading, devout, scholarly, up-to-date, full of movement and strength."

BAPTIST WHY AND WHY NOT. Twenty-five Papers by Twenty-five Writers. Cloth, 12mo.; pp. 430. Price, \$1.25.

A collection of papers on salient points of the faith and practice of the Baptists, by some of the sharpest thinkers and acutest writers in the South. The volume is well prepared, and is adapted to do much good among the pastors and churches of the South, and it will not be superfluous in the North.—*Journal and Messenger.*

THE BAPTIST POSITION AND THE POSITION FOR BAPTISTS. Rev. J. F. Love. 12mo.; pp. 112. Price, cloth, 25 cents; paper, 15 cents.

THE STORY OF YATES, THE MISSIONARY. Charles E. Taylor, D.D. Cloth, 12mo.; pp. 300. Price, 50 cents.

A wonderful book. Strikingly illustrated. Magnificent picture of Dr. Yates; his private seal on the title page; picture of his wife; a charming picture of the country home where he was brought up; a map of China; a map of Shanghai, drawn by himself, and other pictures of interest. It has become very popular, and many thousands have been sold.

PARLIAMENTARY LAW. F. H. Kerfoot, D.D. Cloth, 12mo.; pp. 196. Price, 75 cents.

An able and practical work. It has been adopted as a standard in the Southern Baptist Convention, and in the State Conventions of Tennessee, Missouri, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Kentucky, Mississippi and Louisiana, and is used as a text-book in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and in the Rochester Theological Seminary, and in the Carson and Newman College.

NORMAL STUDIES, SUNDAY SCHOOL WORKERS. Vol. 1. The Sunday School. Rev. B. W. Spilman. Boards, 16mo.; pp. 92. Single copy, 25 cents; per dozen, 12½ cents each.

NORMAL STUDIES. Vol. II. An elementary study of the Bible by books. A year's course of weekly lessons for normal classes, young people's meetings, Bible classes, and individual studies. By Rev. Hight C. Moore. Boards, 16mo.; pp. 134. Price, single copy, 30 cents; per dozen, 22 cents each.

A GREAT TRIO: JETER, FULLER, YATES. Three lectures before the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. By Rev. W. R. L. Smith, D.D. Paper, 12mo.; pp. 116. Price, 25 cents.

We Publish the Southern Baptist Convention Series of Literature.

BAPTIST SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD,

J. M. FROST, Cor. Sec'y.

Nashville, Tenn.

BOOKS OF GREAT WORTH.

The History of Christian Preaching.

By T. Harwood Pattison, D.D. 12mo., 428 pages. Price, \$1.50 net; postpaid, \$1.65.
A series of monographs on the great preachers of the different periods and schools.

"A book of very rare interest and information."—The Southwestern Presbyterian.

"The best and most comprehensive history of preaching in our language."—The Lutheran World.

A Manual of Church History.

Complete in Two Volumes.

By Albert Henry Newman, LL.D. Price, per volume, \$1.75 net; postpaid, \$1.95.
Covers the period from the institution of the church to 1903.

"It would be hard to find a work on church history that could be so heartily recommended to the average pastor and layman, and yet would be so useful as a text-book in connection with class work. I expect to refer my students to it constantly."—Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch, Department of Church History, Rochester Theological Seminary.

The New Day.

By Russell H. Conwell, D.D. 16mo., 117 pages. Price, 50 cents net; postpaid, 56 cents.

This is a series of practical papers for young men. Doors of usefulness and of advancement are open to them now as never before.

"Readers will find a glow of hope, of enthusiasm, of optimism and of radiant sunshine about these pages."—Western Christian Advocate.

The Ethics of the Christian Life.

In Press.

By Henry E. Robins, D.D., sometime President of Colby College, and Professor in Rochester Theological Seminary, and representing the work and study of twenty years.

American Commentary on the Old Testament.

To Be Published in Parts.

Commentary on Job.

By Principal J. T. Marshall, of Manchester Baptist College, England. 8vo., 131 pages. Price 75 cents net.

Not burdened with useless comments on passages that are perfectly clear, but giving needed help on points that are obscure.

A Handbook of Christian Doctrine.

By Henry C. Graves, D.D. 16mo., 175 pages. Price, 75 cents net; postpaid, 82 cents.

A text-book for training schools, especially adapted to use in the schools of the Home Mission Society in the South. It is based on Dr. Hovey's "Theology," with his consent. Is clear in style, concise in treatment, and well arranged. The number of scriptural references is an admirable feature.

Every Creature.

By Rev. M. T. Lamb. 16mo., 94 pages, rough paper cover. Price, 15 cents.

An appeal for personal work. Mr. Lamb enforces upon Christians the imperative duty of so revising methods and measures as that Christ shall be presented to every one.

The Superintendent of Missions in Vermont ordered one hundred copies in October and said: "I wish I could personally give it to every pastor in Vermont." Two of his pastors have since secured quantities of the book to place in the hands of their people.

The Great Awakening of 1740.

By Rev. F. L. Chapell. 16mo., 144 pages. Price, 75 cents net; postpaid, 82 cents.

A series of monographs on Edwards, Whitefield, the Tennets of New Jersey, and others active in the great spiritual awakening that came to New England in 1740.

"Far and away the best account of the great revival that we have seen."—The Western Recorder.

American Baptist Publication Society.

PHILADELPHIA.

Southwestern House, 1407 Olive St.,

ST. LOUIS, MO.

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

The next regular session will begin October 1st and continue eight months.

Thorough courses of study are given in all departments of theological education.

All studies are elective.

Four degrees are conferred, including a post-graduate degree.

The regular course for the degree of Master in Theology covers three years.

An admirable course of one year in English, without degree, is adapted to the needs of busy pastors who cannot remain for a more extended period.

A great Library is open to all students.

Cost of living in Louisville is not high.

For Catalogue or other information, address

E. Y. MULLINS, President,
Louisville, Ky.

For information as to financial aid, address

B. P. SMITH,
Room 10, New York Hall,
Louisville, Ky.

Books Published by the Sunday School Board.

SENT POSTPAID ON RECEIPT OF PRICE.

THE PASTOR AND THE SUNDAY SCHOOL. (Seminary Lectures.) W. E. Hatcher, D.D. Cloth, 12mo.; pp. 180. Price, 50 cents.

Many a pastor will feel a deep regret that he did not have it before he was ordained. The book will live. It meets the need of the times.—W. C. Taylor.

PASTORAL LEADERSHIP OF SUNDAY SCHOOL FORCES. (Seminary Lectures.) Rev. A. F. Schauffer, D.D. Cloth, 12mo.; pp. 176. Price, 50 cents. A great work by a great expert.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY SUNDAY SCHOOL. (Seminary Lectures.) Rev. S. H. Greene, D.D., LL.D., Pastor Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C. Cloth, 12mo. Price, 50 cents.

THE YOUNG PROFESSOR. A Story of Bible Inspiration. Eldridge B. Hatcher, Cloth, 12mo.; illustrated; pp. 503. Price, \$1.25.

"The author has produced a live and living book. Though in the nature of a story, its theme is lofty and commanding—God's authorship of the Bible. A strong book on inspiration—a work of easy reading, devout, scholarly, up-to-date, full of movement and strength."

BAPTIST WHY AND WHY NOT. Twenty-five Papers by Twenty-five Writers. Cloth, 12mo.; pp. 430. Price, \$1.25.

A collection of papers on salient points of the faith and practice of the Baptists, by some of the sharpest thinkers and acutest writers in the South. The volume is well prepared, and is adapted to do much good among the pastors and churches of the South, and it will not be superfluous in the North.—*Journal and Messenger.*

THE BAPTIST POSITION AND THE POSITION FOR BAPTISTS. Rev. J. F. Love. 12mo.; pp. 112. Price, cloth, 25 cents; paper, 15 cents.

THE STORY OF YATES, THE MISSIONARY. Charles E. Taylor, D.D. Cloth, 12mo.; pp. 300. Price, 50 cents.

A wonderful book. Strikingly illustrated. Magnificent picture of Dr. Yates; his private seal on the title page; picture of his wife; a charming picture of the country home where he was brought up; a map of China; a map of Shanghai, drawn by himself, and other pictures of interest. It has become very popular, and many thousands have been sold.

PARLIAMENTARY LAW. F. H. Kerfoot, D.D. Cloth, 12mo.; pp. 196. Price, 75 cents.

An able and practical work. It has been adopted as a standard in the Southern Baptist Convention, and in the State Conventions of Tennessee, Missouri, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Kentucky, Mississippi and Louisiana, and is used as a text-book in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and in the Rochester Theological Seminary, and in the Carson and Newman College.

NORMAL STUDIES, SUNDAY SCHOOL WORKERS. Vol. I. The Sunday School. Rev. B. W. Spilman. Boards, 16mo.; pp. 92. Single copy, 25 cents; per dozen, 12½ cents each.

NORMAL STUDIES. Vol. II. An elementary study of the Bible by books. A year's course of weekly lessons for normal classes, young people's meetings, Bible classes, and individual studies. By Rev. Hight C. Moore. Boards, 16mo.; pp. 134. Price, single copy, 30 cents; per dozen, 22 cents each.

A GREAT TRIO: JETER, FULLER, YATES. Three lectures before the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. By Rev. W. R. L. Smith, D.D. Paper, 12mo.; pp. 116. Price, 25 cents.

We Publish the Southern Baptist Convention Series of Literature.

BAPTIST SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD,

J. M. FROST, Cor. Sec'y.

Nashville, Tenn.

EDITORS.

E. Y. MULLINS, D.D., LL.D.,
Editor-in-Chief.

J. R. SAMPEY, D.D., LL.D.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN, Ph.D., D.D.

A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D.

W. O. CARVER, D.D.

E. C. DARGAN, D.D.

GEO. B. EAGER, D.D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

REV. B. H. CARROLL, D.D., LL.D., Waco, Texas.

REV. D. F. ESTES, D.D., Hamilton, N. Y.

REV. J. A. FARMER, D.D., LL.D., Toronto, Canada.

REV. A. H. NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D., Waco, Texas.

REV. H. C. VEDDER, D.D., Upland, Pa.

BOOKS REVIEWED IN THIS NUMBER:

Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit, by Auguste Sabatier; New Psychology, by J. P. Gordy; From Love to Praise, by Herrick Johnson; Things Fundamental, by Charles Edward Jefferson; A Short Introduction to the Literature of the Bible, by Richard G. Moulton; Why We Believe the Bible, by Henry Melville King; Shakespeare's Tragedy of King Lear, Rolfe Edition; The Rod that Budded, by Robert J. Miller; Going to College, by Waitman Barbe; The Model Christian, by Theodore Ledyard Cuyler; Vocal and Literary Interpretation of the Bible; by S. S. Curry; Songs of All the Colleges, by David B. Chamberlain and Karl P. Harrington; The Power of God unto Salvation, by Benjamin B. Warfield; Psychology, by John Dewey; For Whom Christ Died, by William R. Richards; Stories from Life; A Book for Young People, Orison Swett Morden; An Introduction to the Bible for Teachers of Children. A Manual for Use in the Sunday Schools or in the Home, by Georgia Louise Chamberlin; The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Kingdom of God and the Church, by Geerhardus Vos; A New Parliamentary Manual, by Edmond Palmer; The Story of Daniel the Prophet, by Stephen N. Haskell; The Christian Conversationalist or, the Spiritual Apostolate, Dealing with the Problems of Individual Work for Individuals, Rufus Washington Weaver; An Autobiography by Herbert Spencer; Das Aelteste Evangelium, Ein Beitrag zum Verstandnis des Markus Evangeliums und der altesten evangelischen Ueberlieferung, by Von Johannes Weiss; Die Fugger in Rom 1495-1523, mit studien zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Finanzwesens jener Zeit, by Von Dr. Aloys Schulte; Our Denominational Outlook, by Augustus H. Strong; Critical Questions; New Light on the Life of Jesus, by Charles Augustus Briggs; The Life of Jesus, by Oscar Holtzmann; Tragedy of Hamlet, Rolfe Edition; The History of the English Bible, by Blackford Condit; Barnas Sears, a Christian Educator, His Making and Work, by Alvah Hovey; Forms of English Poetry, by Charles F. Johnson; The Laos of North Siam, by Lillian Curtis; The Life of Frederick William Farrar, by his son, Reginald Farrar; Cardinal Newman, by William Barry; The United States in Our Own Times, by E. Benj. Andrews; Lux Crucis, by Samuel M. Gardenhire; An Inquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, by James Drummond; Our New Edens, by J. R. Miller; The American Natural History, by William T. Hornaday; Kindly Light, by Florence Morse Kingsley; Bacteria, Yeasts, and Molds in the Home, by W. H. Conn; Self Help, by Samuel Smiles; "Faces Toward the Light," by Sylvanus Stall; The Interlinear Literal Translation of the Hebrew Old Testament, by George Richer Berry.